

5783. Also, petition of the Sunbury Unit, Veterans' Welfare League of Northumberland County, Pa., requesting repeal of the Neutrality Act and substitution of a cash-and-carry system, keeping one great thing in mind—America shall not go to war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5784. Also, petition of the Schuylkill Classis (Schuylkill County, Pa.) Ministerium of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, requesting retention of the arms-embargo provision of the Neutrality Act; to write back into that law all needful cash-and-carry clauses and controls; for peace, to preserve, to maintain, and to promote peace; to utilize all established constitutional, ordinary, and extraordinary prerogatives to their full capacity of American statesmanship for the furtherance of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5785. Also, petition of F. S. Vogelsang and other citizens of Pottsville, Palo Alto, Port Carbon, and Minersville, Pa., to keep the present Neutrality Act intact; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5786. Also, petition of Louis F. Pounder and other citizens of Gordon, Ashland, Fountain Springs, Girardville, Locust Dale, and Ashland, Pa., requesting to have the arms-embargo provision of the present Neutrality Act retained, and to provide strict cash and carry for all other commodities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5787. Also, petition of the Reverend W. I. Shambaugh, First Evangelical Church of Milton, Pa., and other citizens, to keep America out of Europe's war by avoiding foreign entanglements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5788. Also, petition of Washington Camp, No. 134, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Port Carbon, Pa., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act, but if a change must be made it be strictly cash-and-carry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5789. Also, petition of Lincoln Post, No. 73, American Legion, Shamokin, Pa., requesting strict neutrality, and opposing any action that might involve this country in any foreign war; urging that Army and Navy be built strong enough to defend the United States against invasion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5790. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of H. J. Gerhardtstein and 400 other citizens of Fort Wayne and New Haven, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5791. Also, resolution of the Allen County Republican Labor Club, Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5792. Also, resolution of the Fort Wayne Chamber of Commerce, urging the United States to maintain a fair, impartial, and lasting peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5793. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution adopted by the West Los Angeles Democratic Club, No. 1, to prevent profiteering and demanding that laws be made with adequate penalties applied and enforced to bring prices back to the normal standard and at no time shall they raise unless wages are increased at the same ratio; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5794. By Mr. McCORMACK: Petition of Edward C. Dullea, of Dorchester, Mass., and 76 others, opposing any change in present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5795. Also, petition of M. A. Albisser, of Roxbury, Mass., and 35 others, advocating retention of present arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5796. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Charles H. Hawkins and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., urging no change in the neutrality law and no cash and carry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5797. Also, petition of Herbert Stobb and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., urging no change in the neutrality law and no cash and carry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5798. Also, petition of John Kain and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing any change in the neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5799. Also, petition of citizenship chairman, Mountain State Farm Women's Club, Roneys Point, W. Va., urging that we oppose repealing of the neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5800. By Mr. SCHAFER of Michigan: Resolution of the Grand Lodge (Mich.) Lodge, No. 179, Free and Accepted Masons, opposing any changes in the present neutrality law, and requesting that arms embargo be retained; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5801. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Polish Falcons of America, of Pittsburgh, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the newly established Polish Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of Mercies, almighty and most tender God, who hast promised to those who seek Thee with all their heart that, as far as the east is from the west, so far wilt Thou remove their transgressions from them, and that, like as a father pitieth his own children, so is the Lord merciful to them that fear Him: We pray for the daily renewal of the spirit of true joy which the sense of Thy abiding presence alone can give, and for a steadfast heart to meet with constant cheerfulness the anxieties and trials of our life, that joy and trial alike may be sanctified to us as we yield ourselves—spirit, soul, and body—to the fulfillment of our sacred duty to our God, our Nation, and the world. Grant unto us, unworthy though we be, a clear vision of the beauty of holiness and a sure confidence in Him who is the strong Son of God, immortal love, even Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, October 16, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Andrews	Davis	King	Reynolds
Austin	Donahey	La Follette	Russell
Bailey	Downey	Lee	Schwartz
Bankhead	Ellender	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Frazier	Lucas	Sheppard
Barkley	George	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bilbo	Gibson	McCarran	Slattery
Borah	Gillette	McKellar	Smathers
Bridges	Green	McNary	Stewart
Brown	Guffey	Maloney	Taft
Bulow	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Okla.
Burke	Hale	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Harrison	Murray	Townsend
Byrnes	Hatch	Neely	Truman
Capper	Hayden	Norris	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	Nye	Van Nuys
Chandler	Hill	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chavez	Holman	Overton	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Pittman	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably detained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CIVIL-SERVICE SYSTEM

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] a member of the Special Committee to Investigate the Administration and Operation of the Civil

Service Laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, created by Senate Resolution 198, Seventy-fifth Congress, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. M. M. Logan, late a Senator from the State of Kentucky.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Thirty-first Annual Reunion of the Second Ohio Volunteer Infantry of the Spanish-American War, held at Findlay, Ohio, favoring the maintenance of a strong and adequate national defense in all its branches, and also an efficient merchant marine; condemning nazi-ism, communism, and other alien "isms"; and calling upon the President and the Congress to keep the Nation out of war "except in defense of our liberties, institutions, and ideals," which was ordered to lie on the table.

ADDRESS BY SERGEANT YORK ON NEUTRALITY AND THE ARMS EMBARGO

[Mr. MINTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of neutrality and the arms embargo, delivered by Sergeant York on Wednesday, October 4, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEUTRALITY AND PEACE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939.

Mr. WALSH obtained the floor.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I desire to make two unanimous-consent requests, and I wish to explain them. It will take me but a moment to do so.

Last night I delivered an address over the National Broadcasting Co. network during the National Radio Forum arranged by the Washington Star. The address related to the pending question. I appreciate the honor that has been offered me by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], to have that address printed in the RECORD. I have asked to be excused from accepting his offer, for the reason that I wish to be entirely and wholly responsible for the address being in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Further, I wish to be considerate of the time of my colleagues in this distinguished body, and I think I can conserve that time by putting the address in the RECORD, which will make it unnecessary for me to repeat its substance and material. So, Mr. President, my first request is for unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the address, the subject of which is Changing Embargoes for National Defense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGING EMBARGOES FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The United States intends not to go to war, not to intervene, and not to become a belligerent.

In the pending war, the nationals of the United States will be hindered and impeded by their Government in their commerce on the seas with belligerents. They will not have the aid of their Government in that commerce. They will not have even the immunity from interference by their Government which has been the common right of the nationals of all neutrals during all times.

It is absurd to say that the United States intervenes when, by statute, it embargoes its nationals, its vessels on the high seas, and everything it produces.

The scare talk that lifting the embargo means war beclouds rational consideration of the facts and policy. It should be given little weight. It seems to me to be illogical. We cannot become a belligerent and go to war unless some foreign state attacks us, or unless we attack some other state.

On the first alternative, I point to the fact that the Congress is in extraordinary session for the express purpose of enacting additional defense legislation calculated to build up our strength so that no foreign state will choose to attack us.

On the second alternative, you are conscious that the determination of the people of this country to remain at peace is such that we will not become an aggressor and declare war on any state, save as a last defense of our security and the principles which constitute the life of the republic.

During the course of my discussion, I hope to make clear that the legislation which Congress now debates is designed to avoid causes

for war, and to remove, as far as possible, from the United States even the chance events which might irritate our own people into warlike fervor. Without an act of Congress, we cannot become a belligerent, we cannot intervene in a military way, we cannot go to war.

We consider the pending question in the light of the settled purpose of Congress to not send our sons and daughters overseas to engage in foreign wars. The last act, even of national defense, is the mobilizing of the youth of America to engage in mortal combat. So let us settle back and calmly consider the choice that we have to make between embargoes.

We start with a true premise, namely: the pending legislation constitutes a substitution of a broad embargo for the narrow embargo which now exists.

The erroneous impression, implicit in the popular slogan "Lift the Embargo, and Substitute Cash and Carry," is corrected through the debate which is proceeding in the Senate.

Now that a state of war has been proclaimed, we are not to choose between embargo and no embargo. We are to choose between two embargoes. The present one prohibits export of arms, ammunition, or implements of war. The contemplated substitute embargo would bar from the seas American vessels, American men, and American articles and materials. If it should become law, nothing American whatever could be in commerce on the high seas between the United States and a belligerent port, between the United States and a neutral port, where the commerce enters or passes through combat areas to be prescribed by the President, because title must change to the purchaser before it leaves the United States. This would avoid the hazard of inflammatory reaction on us from sinking of property.

The deprivation of freedom of our citizens to travel would be extensive, for it would be unlawful, except under rules prescribed by the President, for any citizen of the United States to proceed into or through combat areas or to travel on any vessel of belligerents. This would render remote the provocation from loss of life.

An exception is created favoring Canada. Passengers and articles or materials could be lawfully carried by American vessels on lakes, rivers, and inland waters as well as by aircraft over lands bordering the United States, though such transportation would be subject to such restrictions, rules, and regulations as the President shall prescribe.

The unfortified line, 3,000 miles long, between Canada and the United States moves us to favor the cause of Canada as a protection of our tranquillity.

Moreover, this accords with our ancient friendship and the homogeneity of principles and ideals of our two countries.

The harsh restrictions on vessels include loss of established transportation routes and connections gained in a competitive battle at great cost to our Government and its citizens through 20 years of struggle. In parlance of the sea, "we would not keep the berth warm."

Also included would be the loss to our producers of fruit, cotton, wheat, and other agricultural products, of a delicately balanced refrigerating, storage, transportation, and marketing organism, the repercussions of which must be cushioned with taxpayers' money; the deprivation of neutrals and belligerents, who are dependent upon our natural resources brought to them through American commerce, of diet, clothing, and other necessities of life; the making difficult of procurement for America of strategic and essential materials, because our ships could not afford to go out empty of cargo for the sole purpose of bringing back these materials. These materials are essential to our national defense. They include manganese, aluminum, antimony seed, chromium, coconut-shell char, Manila fiber, mica, nickel, wool, optical glass, quartz crystal, quicksilver, quinine, rubber, silk, tin, and tungsten. In addition to these, we must lose freedom of access to 22 critical commodities, such as coffee, cadmium, cork, cryolite, graphite, opium, etc.

Most serious of all the injuries suffered through the severity of the restrictions upon American vessels is the injury to our national defense. The Mercantile Marine Act of 1936, under which we are building up our merchant fleet, was based on its auxiliary service to the United States Navy. A fleet must have fuel; it must, therefore, have tankers with competent speed. A fleet must have feeding and housing also. It must have vessels for hospitalization, for shelter of personnel of small vessels, such as submarines, aircraft, and destroyers. It must have access to basic materials and to supplies. Without a merchant marine a navy could not serve.

Therefore it is to be hoped that the restrictive embargoes on American shipping may be reasonably relaxed by amendment of the pending bill.

But, dealing with the proposed legislation as it stands tonight, I favor its adoption for the following reasons:

It would promote our national defense.

It would make more remote our getting into war.

It would increase the probability of victory of the Allies.

It would tend to shorten the war.

It would keep the battle front far away from America.

It would help to keep the ocean the protection for us that it has been while our vis-à-vis Navy was under the British flag.

The United States has been on the defensive throughout the Seventy-sixth Congress, including this special session. While the Military Affairs Committees of the House and Senate developed a military, naval, and aerial plan for national defense, the committees of both Houses having jurisdiction of our foreign relations were at work trying to promote such governmental action as would keep us at peace and at the same time protect our free institutions and our territory from aggression. The evidence showed at the beginning

of the session an environment of danger—wars proceeding, all the great treaty powers of the world armed and getting ready for mobilization, even the Western Hemisphere penetrated covertly and in peaceful disguise by the dynamic foreign policy of national socialism, having the implications of an effort to set up a world empire. Within striking distance of the Panama Canal, namely, in Colombia, an airways system, of which the crews were at least 95 percent German; a system of air lines being established around Latin America, with adequate bases and stations and stocks of convertible parts adaptable to military planes as well as commercial planes, so that if Germany wanted to fly military versions of the Fokke-Wulf planes to Latin America they would there have ready adequate supplies for military use. The parts of the commercial ships ready in Latin America are interchangeable with parts for bombers and for other military planes. If Germany should wish to send a large number of bombing planes through Latin America to our southern boundaries she would have the facilities to do so, she would have the fuel supplies in large reserves, she would have the parts, she would have the replacements, and the personnel, if they were needed.

Such a picture clearly given to the Committee on Military Affairs could not be ignored with prudence. It appeared from the evidence that Germany was sending able technicians to Latin America who had recently been trained in special courses in the economic theories and the political philosophies of their own country, in technique, in diplomacy, and in the language of the country where they were going.

Moreover, the trend of exportation of aircraft was significant. Whereas our Latin American exports of aeronautical products in 1938 increased 19.7 percent over 1937, Latin American sales of totalitarian aircraft gained about 300 percent in those 2 years. This tremendous gain in totalitarian exports of aeronautical products in Latin America was consistent with the foreign policy of Germany recently associated with claims of pressure of population, the so-called natural right to room to live, the search for raw materials, and with geographic and political ambitions of world extent. New World contours had already been etched on the globe by the bayonet of totalitarian powers.

The present war had not yet begun. It was anticipated by some. Nevertheless, the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate was informed that if Germany should get control of Spain and Portugal, establish bases in the Azores, in the Cape Verde Islands, and in the Spanish and Portuguese colonies in west Africa, she would have complete control, so far as the air is concerned, of the eastern half of the Atlantic Ocean. Seventeen hundred of the airplanes that Germany then had were capable of flying from the west coast of Africa to the east coast of South America. Prudence dictated that Congress contemplate the possibility of such progress that she would be able to fly in the near future from the Cape Verde Islands to the United States.

The possibility, even though remote, of Germany conquering England and France, obtaining control of their navies and investing Canada and nearby islands, made national defense a paramount concern of this session of Congress.

The cold facts which confronted us demanded prompt measures to strengthen our Military Establishment. With relatively little debate, Congress appropriated approximately \$2,000,000,000 to effectuate the President's plan for this purpose.

Indirectly involved in this study was our national attitude toward the possible belligerents in the anticipated war. This attitude also primarily concerned our national defense. The crash of a bomber being tested on our west coast, in which a French officer perished, precipitated the foreign-policy issue. The identical differences arose over sales of planes to Britain and France, already contracted for, as we are now debating on the so-called Neutrality Act of 1939. It became clear to us that the sale and exportation of military planes to Great Britain and France was a proper element of our national defense, because it stepped up production in this country of such defensive weapons and it did not interfere with procurement for ourselves; it developed the special knowledge and skill of our scientists and workmen, so that we could move forward with the progress of those who learn by experience in their use of the technical improvements which so soon render obsolete the munitions of current days.

Here let me indicate something which I regard as a natural fallacy. Distinguished debaters who oppose the pending resolution argue that we should keep the munitions which we manufacture for our own defense, and that we should not ship them abroad. The answer is: We do not want these particular munitions. If we should ever need munitions, we would want the most modern product of the experience we are now gaining at the expense of the foreign purchasers. If we should ever need munitions, we would want the capacity to reproduce and keep the line coming. We would not want to be dependent on stores of obsolete planes, for example. Therefore, sale to the Allies then and now is an important element of our defensive plan.

I discuss neutrality only briefly because the law of self-defense transcends other rules of international conduct.

Montesquieu, speaking to us with venerable accent and profound wisdom, says:

"Reason is the spirit of the law; if there be no reason, there is no law."

We are familiar with the rule of self-defense, which extends to whatever limit of action may be necessary.

The reason for this in domestic law is the same for international law, namely, imperative necessity.

If we were neutral, the obligations on us as a government would not require us to do what we propose to do in the way of embargoing

the intercourse of our nationals with other neutrals and belligerents. Even though international law forbids the supplying in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power to a belligerent power, of arms, ammunition, and implements of warfare, or of war material of any kind whatever, nevertheless, a neutral power is not bound to prevent the export or transit, by its nationals, for the use of either belligerents, of arms, ammunition, or, in general, of anything which could be of use to an army or fleet.

The rights of a neutral government are thus less than those of its nationals.

In 1935 and 1937, in connection with the neutrality legislation, and during the campaign of 1938, as well as in this Seventy-sixth Congress, I have stated my position publicly—that it would have been better for this Government to repeal the Embargo Acts and return to international law. The foregoing is the essential part thereof affecting the pending issue. The record would have been clearer for posterity. The attitude of America would have accorded with her tradition, namely, an attitude of independence, though not isolation. She would have been free to adapt her action to the changing circumstances. Since it has become apparent that this cannot be done, and that the Government, as such, is about to adhere to restrictive action which it is not bound by international law to take, we are not concerned with the neutrality or unneutrality of the resolution. We are concerned only with the fact that it is in our interest as a sovereignty and for the peace and security of our nationals that we adopt it.

By the Embargo Act of 1937, our attitude, as a government, has the effect of partiality to Germany. It is as effective in interfering with acquisition of arms, ammunition, and implements of war by the Allies as a blockade successfully maintained by Germany. Pro tanto, it is as effective as a fleet of submarines operating against the Allies.

The folly in the act of 1937, which caused a few of us to vote against it, is now more widely recognized. It undertook to bind the United States in advance of the event to a course of action, the need and the consequence of which we could not foresee.

Now, needing the defense value of speedy victory by the Allies, we observe our embargo of 1937 operating against the Allies and in favor of the aggressor.

We now see that we deprive the Allies of rights belonging to them by virtue of their geographical position. As we have pointed out, the exercise of these rights by them would tend to protect our institutions and our peace. The early success of the Allies is vitally necessary to keep the unplumbed depths of ocean between the aggressor and us.

To the extent that the proposed resolution binds us to embargoes in some other future war, it is subject to a similar criticism—that we cannot foretell what our interest may be or what position we should take.

It is my opinion that the resolution ought to be amended to provide for its expiration as soon as the state of war has ceased to exist.

Our present grave concern about the preservation of republican liberty in this country dictates adherence to the exclusive prerogative of this Government to decide as each case arises what character of international conduct this Government will adopt.

Chief Justice Hughes, when Secretary of State, within a few years after the World War, characterized this policy in an address to the American Bar Association, thus:

"Our people are still intent upon abstaining from participation in the political strife of Europe. They are not disposed to commit this Government in advance to the use of its power in unknown contingencies, preferring to reserve freedom of action in the confidence of our ability and readiness to respond to every future call of duty. They have no desire to put their power in pledge, but they do not shirk cooperation with other nations whenever there is a sound basis for it and a consciousness of community of interest and aim. Cooperation is not dictatorship and it is not partisanship. On our part it must be the cooperation of a free people drawing their strength from many racial stocks, and a cooperation that is made possible by a preponderant sentiment permitting governmental action under a system which denies all exercise of autocratic power. It will be the cooperation of a people of liberal ideals, deeply concerned with the maintenance of peace and interested in all measures which find support in the common sense of the country as being practical and well designed to foster common interests."

As a people we would like to have our Government on friendly terms with all states—totalitarian as well as democratic. We would not interfere with the right of every nation to conform to its own beliefs without trespassing upon us, but in both peace and war this Republic must defend itself against dominance by others and against insidious sapping of the battlements of its freedom.

I credit the distinguished opponents of the pending resolution with recognition of the dangers of isolation. I think that it is inaccurate to label them "isolationists." However, there are worthy citizens who have communicated to me the belief that we should adopt an attitude of withdrawal commercially to our continental area for the duration of the war. I believe that it is the general opinion of all Senators now debating the issue that such action would require nationalizing of all production and industry and further centralizing all government in Washington. We are aware of the difficulties of enforcement of that type of embargo, exemplified, as they were, by even bloody resistance during the Jefferson embargo.

As the historian, Bancroft, has so well put it: "Commerce defies every wind, outrides every tempest, invades every zone."

Moreover, the danger of establishing nonparticipation in the trade and finance of the world is that such action would require a vast financing scheme to further organize control of all business and commercial activities, to cushion the fall of industrial employment, agricultural marketing, and the lack of necessary materials not obtainable here. The dictatorship perfected thereby would insure to us and to our posterity a curse of unhappiness.

Isolation would be almost as dangerous to our institutions as war. By either isolation or war, we would lose much that our forefathers sacrificed to gain and to transmit to us.

To choose the type of embargo provided for by the pending resolution, instead of the existing embargo, would aid in our national defense and would tend to prevent both isolation and war.

It would help this generation of Americans to discharge their high obligation to preserve the Republic and to maintain peace.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, my second request is that there be printed in the RECORD following the address just ordered printed an amendment which I propose to offer to the pending joint resolution, the effect of which, if it should be agreed to by the Senate, would be to make this so-called Neutrality Act of 1939 expire with the expiration of the present war in Europe. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, to have printed in the RECORD, printed in the usual form, and lie on the table the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Am I correct in understanding that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont touches the question of the expiration of the pending joint resolution?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. If the pending joint resolution should become a law, under the amendment, if agreed to, the law would become functus officio on the termination of the war in Europe.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. AUSTIN to the pending joint resolution was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. AUSTIN to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939, viz: At the end of the joint resolution insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. Whenever all proclamations issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked, this joint resolution shall have no further force or effect; but offenses committed and penalties, forfeitures, or liabilities incurred under this joint resolution while it was in force and effect may be prosecuted and punished, and suits and proceedings for violations of such joint resolution or of any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto may be commenced and prosecuted in the same manner and with the same effect as if such joint resolution were still in force and effect."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I offer two amendments to the pending joint resolution, which I should like to have printed in the usual form, printed in the RECORD, and lie on the table until such time as they may be considered by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado to the pending joint resolution were ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939, viz:

On page 16, line 13, after the word "materials", insert "(other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war enumerated by the President under the authority of sec. 4)."

On page 18, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following new section:

"EXPORT OF ARMS, AMMUNITION, AND IMPLEMENTS OF WAR

"SEC. 4. (a) Whenever any proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 (a) is in effect, it shall be unlawful to export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States until all right, title, and interest therein shall have been transferred for cash to a foreign state. The shipper of such arms, ammunition, or implements of war shall be required to file with the collector of the port from or through which they are to be exported a declaration under oath that there exists in no citizen of the United States any right, title, or interest in such arms, ammunition, or implements of war, and to comply with such rules and regulations as shall be promulgated

from time to time. Any such declaration so filed shall be a conclusive estoppel against any claim of any citizen of the United States of right, title, or interest in such arms, ammunition, or implements of war. No loss incurred by any such citizen in connection with the sale or transfer of right, title, and interest in any such arms, ammunition, or implements of war shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States. As used in this subsection, the term 'cash' shall not include ordinary commercial credits or short-time obligations.

"(b) Insurance written by underwriters on arms, ammunition, or implements of war and on vessels carrying such arms, ammunition, or implements of war shall not be deemed an American interest therein, and no insurance policy issued on such arms, ammunition, or implements of war, or vessels, and no loss incurred thereunder or by the owners of such vessels, shall be made the basis of any claim put forward by the Government of the United States.

"(c) The President shall, from time to time by proclamation, definitely enumerate the arms, ammunition, and implements of war, the export of which is restricted by this section. The arms, ammunition, and implements of war so enumerated shall include those enumerated in the President's proclamation No. 2163, of April 10, 1936, but shall not include raw materials or any other articles or materials not of the same general character as those enumerated in the said proclamation, and in the Convention for the Supervision of the International Trade in Arms and Ammunition and in Implements of War, signed at Geneva June 17, 1925.

"(d) Whoever, in violation of any of the provisions of this section, shall export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both, and the property, vessel, or vehicle containing the same shall be subject to the provisions of sections 1 to 8, inclusive, title 6, chapter 30, of the act approved June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 223-225; U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 22, secs. 238-245).

"(e) In the case of the forfeiture of any arms, ammunition, or implements of war by reason of a violation of this section, no public or private sale shall be required; but such arms, ammunition, or implements of war shall be delivered to the Secretary of War for such use or disposal thereof as shall be approved by the President of the United States.

"(f) Whenever all proclamations issued under the authority of section 1 (a) shall have been revoked the provisions of this section shall thereupon cease to apply, except as to offenses committed prior to such revocation."

On page 21, line 15, after the word "credit", insert "(including ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations)."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, for several years, particularly since I have been chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the United States Senate, I have been frequently requested to speak on questions relative to our national defense. On these occasions I have stated again and again that I was an advocate of a large, efficient, and powerful Navy, not for the purpose of aggression but for the avoidance of war and the protection of our country.

Never, during these years, have I failed to urge a genuine policy of neutrality, designed for the avoidance of war, as of almost equal importance for our peace as a powerful navy. Nations that are unable to look upon events of a foreign war objectively and map out for themselves a fixed, determined, real policy of neutrality will never be safe from embroilment in the troubles and wars of other nations.

Peace, first and foremost, by assuming the conduct of a true neutral; and secondly, a navy, army, and air force of such efficiency and size as will command the forbearance of all aggressors; these have been my long-continued aims.

A year ago last September at the American Legion National Convention at Los Angeles, on Memorial Day 1938 at Arlington Cemetery, and again on the floor of the Senate on April 17, 1939, and repeatedly on the radio when I discussed the subject of national defense, I asserted that in a world seething with age-old rivalries and ambitions and in which the spirit of war is ever present our country should steadfastly preserve its neutrality. I quote from one of those speeches:

Our own national policy for keeping our country out of war and at peace with the rest of the world rests upon two basic and elementary propositions. One is the observance of strict neutrality whenever and wherever war occurs, and in the meantime and at all times keeping clear of foreign quarrels and entangling alliances. The other is the maintenance of adequate instrumentalities for national defense and, in the conditions now unhappily prevailing throughout the world, adequate instrumentalities for national defense, and adequate land force, sea force, and air force.

These have been my sentiments to this hour. Devoted as I am to the cause of our national defense, in my opinion, a neutrality policy which is sincere, unwavering, and just is

an equally vital correlative to the preservation of peace and domestic tranquility.

The Navy is a physical force operating in the physical field. Neutrality is a state of mind; it operates for peace or war through mental channels. A neutrality that is honest removes animosities and hostilities. A neutrality that is merely a pretense, the use of a name, creates distrust and enmity. The slightest aggressive operation by our Navy could swiftly turn our course from peace to war. In like manner, the elements that constitute a policy of neutrality can sharply convert our attitude from peace to the role of an aggressor. It is the impairment or abandonment of a real policy of neutrality that is a basic cause of war in the world. Because Italy and other European countries have thus far remained neutral, they are not at war.

I believe that every conceivable safeguard should be used to prevent our Nation from being involved in a war that is not of its making, for I place above every other disaster in life the awful sacrifice of human lives that war brings. Nature's catastrophes are at times horrifying, but they affect chiefly the physical forces of life that can be rebuilt, while man-made war crushes and destroys living human beings and the priceless spiritual values of the human family, robs free people of their liberty, and retards for generations the advancement and progress of civilization.

POLITICAL NEUTRALITY

It seems unnecessary to define to the Members of the Senate what is meant by real and genuine neutrality. There is scarcely one Member of this body who has not had to apply a policy of personal neutrality during his political activities. Your own experience, Senators, has taught you that there is only one choice—observe a strict neutrality or commit yourself to one side or the other.

Were those political rivals who declared to you their neutrality honestly neutral when they lent aid and assistance to your opponent? Between men and between nations honest neutrality stands out with all the brilliance and clarity of the midday sun. Pretended neutrality is like the toadstool that in shape and color appears like the mushroom, but hidden in its fibers is the very essence of a death poison.

THE MEANING OF NEUTRALITY

Thomas Jefferson, when Secretary of State in the Cabinet of George Washington in 1793, said that it was a solemn duty of any neutral nation "To prohibit such action as would injure one of the warring powers." He added, "No succor or assistance should be given to either party of foreign wars; no men, arms, or anything else directly serving for war." John Quincy Adams went even further and said, "Neutrality avoids all consideration of the merits of the contest." In no particular does the present proposal to repeal the arms embargo meet the conceptions of neutrality heretofore expressed by these or other American statesmen.

The discussion and consideration of the present neutrality law was based upon a purpose to avoid participation in foreign wars, to prevent a repetition of acts which helped to involve us in the World War—the destruction by belligerents of American lives, ships, and goods on the high seas, and the inflamed feeling of our people because of such incidents.

The nonparticipation policy, withholding of munitions to belligerents, then adopted, we are now asked to change. I inquire at the very outset and in all seriousness, Are we not in seeking repeal placing more importance on our trade than on a policy of absolute neutrality? Is not preserving our peace worthy of any cost or sacrifice in trade at home or abroad? I am not asserting, for it would be unfair, that all those who favor repeal of the arms embargo are thinking of trade benefits. But what answer can anyone favoring repeal make to the assertion that, even if the repeal of the arms embargo is not intended to help promote a business boom, it certainly will permit the sale of implements of war to provide human beings with instruments of death and destruction to use against each other?

To others who assert we must preserve our neutral rights of freedom of trade and freedom of the sea we answer that it is far more important to preserve the rights of the non-

vocal millions of Americans who would be the sacrificial victims of war.

Mr. President, we who are against repeal are primarily opposed now to a parade of war weapons from America to Europe because we never again want to witness the parade of dying and maimed American youths that emerged after the World War from Europe to America.

THE BACKGROUND OF OUR NEUTRALITY LAW

This extraordinary session of the Congress has been called to revise the present neutrality law. Before we take action it is appropriate to review in some detail the consideration Congress gave this subject long before the present war. Commencing in 1935 committees of the Senate and House held hearings for weeks and considered every phase of the problem of neutrality. The study was made at a time when the country was relatively free from propaganda and when our minds were concerned solely with devising ways and means for America to avoid involvement in wars.

These studies demonstrated that two courses of action by our country would certainly lead to involvement. These were: First, an acceptance by the United States of world moral responsibility; and, second, the conviction on the part of the American people that the avoidance of war by us was impossible. Those Americans who accept either of these two views are now privately, if not openly, advocating our participation in the present European war, disregarding the fact that the United States has consistently refused to participate in any international scheme that might lead to war as a possible eventuality.

In the study we then made of the subject of neutrality serious consideration was necessarily given to the American world position in contrast with the world position of European countries. The United States has no European problem such as overpopulation; it has no desire to obtain natural resources necessary for self-sufficiency and national defense; it seeks no colonies; it entertains no longing to revenge ancient rivals. None of these European ambitions concern us, and that is why our domestic welfare prompts us to avoid war, and by a rigid policy of neutrality avoid involvement.

The United States, because of its relative physical security, is almost alone among the world powers able to keep itself free from inducements to join its foreign policy to that of any other nation. The situation in Europe is very different. European nations have been forced to make alliances and agreements under special conditions. Though European nations may have no choice between war and peace, the United States' geographical position and nonalliance policy protects it from ever going to war except when attacked.

Our paramount concern then was, and still should be, to keep the United States out of war—out of any war—to preserve at all hazard our own peace and security; to preserve above all else our own democracy.

The sole question before the committees of the Congress and the Congress itself during the years prior to the enactment of our present neutrality law was, What course of action should America determine in advance that would best preserve peace for us when other nations are at war? What course would minimize the risk of our being drawn into a European war? It was clear that the temptation to join hands with friendly and favored belligerents was to be avoided and also the temptation to prevent the establishment of a close community of interest with the warring nations.

Congress had fully in mind that one of the greatest tests of our neutrality policy would be brought about by a European war in which nations particularly friendly to us would be engaged. It was well understood and known that the maximum pressure for participation of the United States in the European war would be exerted if nations particularly friendly to us became belligerents. Briefly stated, the very situation that exists today was foreseen, understood, and considered when we undertook to define our policy of neutrality.

Furthermore, it was well recognized that an effective neutrality policy could not be maintained by the United States without industrial, commercial, and financial costs. Congress,

after weighing all costs—the cost of keeping out and the cost of going in—almost unanimously decided the cost of human lives, human suffering, and human sacrifices far outweighed any cost in monetary losses. To avoid this stupendous cost Congress believed that all possible measures to resist participation in wars not of our making should be put into effect before a crisis appeared.

After full and lengthy consideration of this whole subject, after having the opinions of many expert authorities on international relations and the views of the State Department, Congress almost unanimously decided in the interest of American peace to establish a neutrality law with rigid restrictions. The purpose of the restrictions was solely to reduce the possibility of America becoming involved through the growth of commercial and financial ties with belligerents. This is the background of our existing neutrality law made in anticipation of just what has occurred and to protect us against the present war propaganda.

THE ISSUE

Because a war crisis in Europe has actually developed it is now proposed that we repeal the measures heretofore made to resist our involvement. The present issue, therefore, is whether or not we shall nullify our views and decisions made for our peace in time of peace and become an economic base of war supplies for one of the European belligerents. The issue is, Shall we now, because war has broken out in Europe, change a "thou shalt not" policy of selling arms and munitions of war to a policy of "thou shalt"? Shall we change our policy of "forbid" to a policy of "permit"? Shall we change our policy of nonintervention to intervention—to the extent of supplying to one of the belligerents destructive war weapons?

Up to this very hour we are at peace. We are not threatened. We are not attacked. We are at peace because the Almighty has separated us from Europe by a vast ocean; because our founders wisely guided us away from European alliances; because "in God we trust," not in the friendships nor promises of nations or men. I inquire what is to be gained, not by certain belligerents, but by America through the proposed change? Will the present embargo on arms tend to keep the United States really neutral longer than will any plan to sell the belligerents war supplies?

THE DANGER OF REVERSING OUR NEUTRALITY POLICY

Mr. President, candor compels me to state that I think of nothing, now that war has swept over Europe, that threatens more certainly to involve us in the present holocaust than deliberately to reverse our present policy of positive refusal to sell war weapons to any or all belligerents, and by solemn enactment offer the output of our munitions' factories for sale, knowing that only one group of belligerents can be our customer. No living being contends that we are morally bound to sell implements of war to any nation at any time. We are free to sell or not to sell. Our declared policy, the present Federal law, now forbids sales.

Instead of pleading here in the Senate of the United States for traffic in arms or war profits, we should be militantly resisting every possible step that will lead to traffic in human lives, the lives of the youths of America.

IT WILL HELP OUR FRIENDS

I am not unmindful of the claim that by opening our airplane and munition factories to belligerents, we will thereby help one side to a quick and perhaps total defeat of its enemy. If this purpose is consummated, repeal of the arms embargo will constitute a direct violation of America's obligation as a neutral. This is easily demonstrated to any unprejudiced mind. The present neutrality law was in existence before the war started. It is at this moment in force. To weaken this law now for the purpose of helping one side is a participation in war, one of degree to be sure, but in what degree no one can estimate in advance. It does not require any extended argument or the recital of precedents to demonstrate that when changes in neutrality laws are made during war the purpose of the change is all-important. When the purpose is solely and obviously to preserve our neutrality, such as some of the proposed changes

in the cash and carry of commodities, no claim of intervention can be made.

How long would any one of the small countries adjoining the war area of Europe remain at peace, if it declared in advance of war that it would not sell instruments of war, and following the outbreak of the present war, turned its munitions plants over to supply death bombs to one group of belligerents?

Why, if we really seek to be neutral, should we dare, merely because we are not adjoining the war fields of Europe and merely because we are larger in area, population, and wealth, do what we conceive no other neutral nation on earth would dare do unless it deliberately sought involvement in war? Instead of removing existing restrictions to help keep us out of war, we should be striving mightily to increase and multiply such restrictions.

To my mind, repeal of the arms-embargo law would be tragic. It would enormously increase our present serious peril. It is tragic enough to become involved in war by having a public opinion favoring peace, changed to one of war, through the ordinary mute incidents of war, our hatreds, our fears, or our sympathies, but it is criminal to plunge a free people into war by incidents and situations which result from efforts made to sell implements of war. War through financial entanglements is the most indefensible of all wars.

WHO ARE URGING REPEAL?

Mr. President who are those urging the repeal of our arms embargo aside from the Chief Executive and the State Department, whose motives, like our own, we concede to be actuated by what they conceive to be the best interests of the Nation? Others, however, disclose motives that seem to me to be based on other considerations than neutrality. I refer to those Americans who believe we should at once enter the war and who are for repeal of the arms embargo as the first step. They, of course, frankly concede they are opposed to the policy of neutrality. They are for war.

ARMS EMBARGO NOT UNNEUTRAL

Others, whose honorable motives we cannot question, though we think them mistaken in judgment, urge the repeal of the arms embargo for various reasons.

One of the most specious of all the arguments advanced during this controversy is to the effect that the arms embargo is unneutral in that it bears unequally upon the nations now at war. Of course, any restrictions or limitations inevitably bear unequally upon different parties. If we sell only for cash that is prejudicial to those without cash. If we require the purchasers to carry away what they have bought, that is prejudicial to those without transport facilities. If we forbid charter of United States ships by any belligerent that is prejudicial to those who had need for the ships and wherewithal to pay for them. The mere fact that by inevitable circumstances the present arms embargo bears unequally upon the nations at war is of itself no valid argument for its repeal.

The conclusion is inevitable, namely, if the embargo is unneutral to one side, lifting it is unneutral to the other. The purpose of neutrality is to avoid participation in war. Whatever steps a neutral country may take to remain neutral in order to avoid participation in a war will invariably affect the various belligerents unevenly. All will conceive it would be unneutral to embargo the export of arms to Japan while permitting their export to China. Likewise, it would be unneutral to permit the export of arms to either group participating in the recent war in Spain. It would be unneutral to embargo the export of arms in Abyssinia, while permitting their export to Italy. No one has claimed that we were unneutral in these three wars which have occurred under our present neutrality law. The precedents for refusing to export arms, munitions, and implements of war are numerous. During the Franco-Prussian War both Belgium and Switzerland placed an embargo on munitions of war. During the Spanish-American War the Netherlands applied a similar embargo. During the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-5, Sweden did the same thing.

THE TEST OF NEUTRALITY

No nation can be charged with unneutrality for taking action made to apply equally to war belligerents. That is the test of neutrality—does a nation's action apply equally to all belligerents? At no time while the present embargo statute was being drafted or when enacted into law was the claim made that it was an unneutral act. Not the actual war in Abyssinia or that in Spain or China, but the threat of the present war in Europe was the first intimation that the law was unneutral.

It is because we desire genuine neutrality, regardless of its effect upon belligerents, that we are against the repeal of the arms embargo. We insist that our neutrality law be motivated, first and last, by a sincere purpose to avoid being drawn into a war.

But I revert to my original question: How will repeal of the arms embargo help to keep us out of war? Some of the proponents of repeal have an answer to this question which is usually expressed in guarded circumlocution. I propose to deal with it candidly. They rest their case on the assertion that this country is vitally concerned in the outcome of the war in Europe; that our national interests are at stake; that victory for Britain and France and defeat for Germany must be obtained at all costs; that if the war is of long duration, somehow or other we shall be drawn into it; that if we give all possible help to France and Britain now, it will tend to shorten the war and to insure their victory without our actually going into the war; that repeal of the arms embargo is one way to help Britain and France, and that when we do so we are helping ourselves.

I do not subscribe to this thesis. I concede that we are concerned with the duration of the war and its outcome. But I say in all earnestness and with every fiber of my being that the day we officially proclaim to the world our intention of becoming the ally of Britain and France and of making the United States their economic base of supplies, we move in the direction of taking the United States into the war and set in motion a chain of circumstances that in all reasonable probability will result in war. And that is the vice of the repeal of the embargo. It has become a token—a symbol. We in substance and effect, by the very act of repealing the embargo, now that the war has started, proclaim our intention of coming to the aid of Britain and France. We are asked to repeal the embargo in the name of neutrality and under the false disguise of a move for peace, when in fact it is the very opposite.

I do not say that retention of the embargo upon munitions will guarantee our escape from involvement in the present war. There can be no absolute guaranty. I do not say that repeal of the embargo will positively lead the United States into the war. I believe it will tend in that direction. I fear that will be the consequence of repeal. Why take the risk? We have nothing to gain and everything to lose.

THE REAL OBJECTIVE

I repeat that underlying the present drive to obtain repeal of the embargo, underlying all the fine-sounding words about neutrality and international law, and the rights of nations, and about the alleged inexpediency and alleged inconsistency of attempting to differentiate between munitions of war and those things from which munitions may be processed, is the unspoken but dominant consideration, namely, to make the United States a base of supplies for Britain and France in the present war. There is no other real reason for repealing the present embargo. And therein lies our danger. For when we make the United States a base of supplies for Britain and France, when we undertake to provide them with munitions and all other needful war materials, we become to all intents and purposes, and behind a smoke screen of professed neutrality, an undeclared partner with them in the war upon Germany and such nations as are or may become allied with her.

We delude ourselves with the thought that it will not be necessary to send troops and that we shall not have to sacrifice American lives. Our partners will make the sacrifice in lives. All we have to do is to supply the munitions and the

foodstuffs; the airplanes but not the pilots; wheat, corn, and cotton, but not "cannon fodder."

But once we become accustomed to the idea that we are partners on the side of Britain and France, the next step follows very naturally—the notion that as a nation we cannot afford to have Britain and France fail. If United States munitions and supplies are not sufficient, we must lend our fleet and finally our soldiers.

I appeal to my colleagues in the Senate to guard against so disastrous a course; and the first step, the unnecessary and avoidable step, is the step which is now proposed—repeal of the embargo.

AID TO THE DEMOCRACIES

Other repealists, at first subtly but now boldly, say "we must aid the democracies of Europe; we cannot remain silent and indirectly give support to the dictators." Let me quote from some of the letters I have received, and which I am sure are similar to what every Senator here has read in his mail:

I believe we should assist the democracies right from the beginning, both morally and financially.

Their war is not just a European war.

If this war should be long drawn out, and if it should develop that Germany was likely to win, I consider it inevitable that we would then be drawn into the war.

Regardless of what some of the sentimentalists and pacifists think, we are undeniably involved in the European situation, whether we like it or not. So, as an American, I feel we must assume our part in this war and preserve our dignity as a nation.

France and England are fighting our battles for us. If they are beaten, the United States will have to do the job.

I firmly believe that the present war is not a private quarrel; that England and France are fighting in the interest of the United States, and if they are defeated our own American liberties that we cherish will be seriously menaced.

Aside from the question of our joining the conflict it would seem to me to be the wise move to help the side whose victory would benefit us most.

Certainly this country cannot stand by and see the democracies beaten.

We feel this country should give every possible aid to France and Britain irrespective of whether it will involve us in this war or not.

We should align ourselves with England and France, cost what it may.

We need to assist what, without doubt, is now our first line of defense, the British Navy.

Whatever idealistic justification can be urged for this attitude, which is more powerful than peace advocates realize, certainly to translate these sentiments into actual effort by our country to take sides with one of the groups of belligerents is far from real and honest neutrality.

AN OVERT ACT

Mr. President, the Congress is now asked to perform an overt act, to declare to the world that we will hereafter in an official way give practical aid and assistance to the belligerents at war, knowing that only one side can be our customers. Furthermore, it is proposed to make this change of policy now in the very midst of a bitter, vicious, and diabolical war.

A neutrality attitude or law deals solely with the relationship that a peaceful nation entertains toward belligerents at war. If a nation's attitude goes beyond its sympathies and actually aids, supports, and supplies munitions to one side, it is not neutrality; it is intervention; it is a direct move from peace toward war.

To my mind, repeal of the arms embargo at this time is a direct assault upon one group of belligerents, and it is in fact deliberately so intended. It will cause resentment—resentment that has not heretofore been manifest. It is, in my judgment, a positive unneutral act that bears all the germs of war breeding. Whatever might be said in favor of repealing the arms embargo before the war, no one can now justify it as an act tending to help keep us out of war. Why is it now proposed? Its only honest justification should be to promote noninvolvement, and it has no such justification.

THE ISSUE MUST NOT BE CONFUSED

We must not permit this issue to be confused. The assertion is made that those who oppose the repeal of the present statutory embargo on the export of munitions of war to belligerents are inconsistent, in that they are at the same time favorable to unrestricted trade with the belligerents and the

exportation to them of all other commodities and supplies. This assertion is utterly mistaken and false. The fact is that those of us who oppose the repeal of the arms-embargo provision of the present law are insisting and demanding that every single, sound proposal that would strengthen our position of neutrality shall be speedily adopted. We are unalterably opposed to the repeal of the arms embargo because it would seriously weaken—indeed, it would emasculate—the present law and would immediately, definitely, and completely destroy our present attitude of neutrality. Repeal would inevitably be construed by the world, even by those governments it would aid, as a deliberate, intentional move to assist one group of belligerents. We insist that such a course of action would directly threaten our peace, security, and future influence in the world and would destroy the powerful position our Nation ought to assume at the present time—namely, genuine, honest, unmitigated neutrality—not only for the purpose of protecting our citizens from involvement in the horrors of the European war, and also to enable us to be in a position, if and when such an eventuality arrives in Europe, to help reestablish peace and order in the world, but, above all, to preserve intact and undefiled our present democratic institutions.

THE LOST OPPORTUNITY

Mr. President, how sad and tragic is our situation. We have been arguing here for weeks in the United States Senate over the sale of war weapons. What a great opportunity is being lost. To my mind, America should stand like the Goddess of Liberty—strong, erect, holding the torch of peace, illuminating this dark, gloomy, and saddened world with rays of future hope to its wrecked humanity, revealing profound and unmistakable sorrow for the human beings being slaughtered in the present world's cataclysm, towering above the misunderstandings, entanglements, hatreds, and ambitions which precipitated it. We can do this only by remaining neutral, a neutrality that may disappoint friendly nations, but one that the world at large will respect. Let our neutrality be based not alone on our own welfare but also upon the premise that when the time comes we will be in a position to serve the human family, to promote the brotherhood of man, to preserve the spiritual values that have come down to us through the centuries, and to welcome the innocent but misguided men and women of all races back to peace, to progress, to another Easter morn.

It may be said that this is idealism; that it is not possible or practicable. Then, at least let us make the effort and also be practical. Can we not be practical without participating in the hellish plague that is sweeping over Europe? Yes; we can build up our Army, Navy, and air force so that if our expressed ideals do not command the respect of the world and secure peace for ourselves, our impregnable military and naval strength will assure us protection if the time should ever come when all the mad leaders of the world turn on us. At least we will then be fighting unitedly and solely for America, and we will be proud to fight for her.

WE CANNOT KEEP OUT

Let me turn now to certain general observations.

The most pernicious and dangerous thought with respect to the present war in Europe is the thought that our own involvement in the war and our own entry into the war are somehow or other inescapable and inevitable; that much as we may wish to escape, we shall not be able to do so; that whether we get in or whether we stay out rests not with ourselves but with the circumstances and events beyond our control. I challenge these implications. I denounce such doctrine.

I consider this to be an utterly mistaken belief and a complete misconception of the realities. I regard the rapid spread of this idea as tending to jeopardize our immunity from the war and as tending to bring to pass the very thing which we profess to be most eager to prevent, namely, war for the United States.

I am shocked and profoundly disturbed to find how prevalent among many officials of our Government and Members of Congress is the notion of the inevitability of our own in-

volved in the war in Europe, the notion that we are destined to be swept into it despite all efforts to stay out.

I say with all earnestness that this is an utterly mistaken notion and one which should be promptly discarded. Our involvement in the war is neither necessary nor inevitable. It can be avoided. War must be escaped, if we are to preserve our own Nation and our own democracy, to say nothing of the lives of our own youth who will be sacrificed if we get into the war. We submit that one important safeguard is to retain the present embargo on munitions, and at the same time take adequate additional precautions.

PROPAGANDA VERSUS HELPLESSNESS OF THE PEOPLE

At work in this country today are propaganda and other forces, unable to treat the present war objectively, which would lead us inevitably toward war. Our bewildered and confused people, desiring peace more than anything else in the world, seem unable to comprehend, let alone move to avert, the reality of this situation, which, if the war continues, may slowly but surely bring this Nation to the brink of another international disaster.

Of what avail is the feeble voice of the people against the overwhelming power of propaganda? Of what account is their plea for peace, unorganized, humble, springing not from the counting rooms but merely from the homes, the firesides, the family circles of the great masses of American people who have little to say about creating wars which their sons and husbands must fight? How can they hope, within their limited capacity, to influence the course of legislation? Groups heretofore bitterly irreconcilable toward the administration on recent domestic economic questions, and of diametrically opposite social philosophies, have now come together on this single issue, with the design of immediately legalizing traffic in death-dealing implements and munitions of war which by its operation insures wartime profits to American industrial and banking interests.

PREJUDICES AND PROFITS

How can the voice of the plain people of America hope to reach the ears of advocates of entry into the war who are determined to take sides, as they assert, to save democracy in Europe lest it be destroyed here? As one of them has written to me:

We feel this country should give every possible aid to the Allies, irrespective of whether it involves us in war or not.

Another writes:

It would improve business in this country, put a good many people back to work, and bring nearer the balancing of the Budget.

Such citizens have permitted their sympathies, hatreds for certain European leaders, and unfounded fears, or their personal interests, to obscure the consequences of our participation in another European "blood bath." They are immune to rational argument and blind to America's true interests. They substitute bitter prejudice or financial gain for the genuine neutral spirit.

How can the pleas of the people hope to touch the hearts of the calloused groups, prompted solely by financial self-interest, which seek to put us into this war in order to reap profits?

Shall we, their representatives in the Senate of the United States, remain deaf and unmoved by their pleas to resist every step that might involve us in war?

War profiteers are enthused again, as they were before and during the World War, to destroy autocratic aggressive forces in the world and save democracy. These who I dare not believe truly represent the vested wealth of America, the bondholders, the speculators, the swivel-chair brigade of 1917, are again on the march for democracy in other lands, though in times of peace and at home they are its bitterest critics. In peacetime, when the Nation finds it necessary, on the principle of ability to pay, to tax wealth to feed the hungry, shelter the homeless, and clothe the naked of our unfortunate brethren, these very groups charge the Government with confiscatory radicalism. In thinly veiled assertions of protest, they inveigh against democracy, rail against legislators trying conscientiously to perform duty; indeed, most acrimoniously assail our Executive when he, in the spirit

of Christian charity, seeks to aid the impoverished and the underprivileged. In peacetime these are reactionary last-ditch Tories, who despise representative government unless they can control its course. Thank God, these aggressive promoters, profiteers, and speculators do not truly represent the American businessmen, who in the main are humane and progressive.

When war comes, when war stocks boom "on the Street," when steel mills start turning out their tools of destruction, when munitions factories burn with activity fashioning weapons of death, when rising prices threaten inflation, when speculative markets bound upward and offer another chance to reap profits at the expense of the mothers and youth of Europe and America, these groups acquire a sudden passion for democratic institutions, not here in our own country but in other parts of the world. If the claim could not be asserted that democracy were threatened, if some case could not be made out by the propagandists to delude our helpless people into the belief that our security is being jeopardized by the conflict between European powers, these groups would have no grounds whatever, except that of trade profits, for urging the repeal of the arms embargo.

Does anyone conversant with the history of this Nation since 1933 believe for a moment that many of these present-hour lip servants of democracy are supporting this joint resolution because of affection for the general policies and objectives of this administration? Let there be no mistake about it: These groups, apart, of course, from the open advocates of belligerent help for the so-called democracies, are interested in just one thing—the profits of war.

OTHER FORCES SUPPORTING REPEAL

I realize that other forces are supporting this traffic in arms and implements of war. I do not impugn their sincerity or question their right to urge their views, though I seriously challenge their reasoning and their judgment. I am conscious that some conscientious citizens see in the present European conflict a war between subversion, irreligion, authoritarianism, on the one side, and the alleged righteous constructive democratic forces of the world, on the other. This is a superficial view. Religion is too deep-seated in the human breast to be crushed by tyrants.

Others whom I have mentioned possess such devotion for certain foreign governments because of blood ties or cultural affinities that they advocate immediate, direct, and unhampered association with the cause of our former Allies. These are influential and unceasing in urging our entrance into the war, or at least open assistance by furnishing arms to one side of this terrible conflict such as is proposed in this measure. Peace is secondary to most of these groups.

Following these views, we would, in effect, by sending arms to one side in this war, be deliberately rendering assistance to the democratic governments of Europe in the hope and belief that in so doing absolute governments would be destroyed in Europe, and our own democracy thus safeguarded. On this theory, is it not cowardice to stay out of the war, to let other nations fight our cause, and merely send them weapons and ammunition? If we believe the issue is salvation of democracy in America, ought we not, in honor and self-respect, to throw all our resources and strength, including our manpower, behind the cause of the former Allies?

But there is no such issue. Our frontier is not on the Rhine, in France, or any other part of the world. Our frontier is the oceans with which the Almighty has surrounded us. If we must fight against subversive forces of the world, let us fight when our security and liberty are assailed here in America.

NOT A WAR OF IDEALS

Let there be no mistake about another fact: This is not a war for ideals of democracy. In 1917 we entered the war, so our people were told and believed, to preserve democratic government, to sustain democratic civilization. How completely we were deluded in realizing these high aims is too well known to bear reiteration. But today we should not again labor under such misapprehensions. It is plainly manifest that ideals are not the motivating force of this war. Quarrels

over territories, struggles for control of subject peoples and their natural resources, the furtherance of nationalistic interests, and preservation of the European balance of power for the victors in the World War are the real reasons for this conflict.

The present disputes arise directly out of the Versailles Treaty, which in spirit, letter, and result abandoned every pretense of adherence to the ideals for which the war was fought. That treaty distributed territories, colonies, and control over hundreds of millions of subject peoples in Europe, Africa, Asia, practically everywhere in the world, on the principle of pirate division of spoils, with little or no concern for the racial, geographical, historical, or ethical rights of millions of innocent, peace-loving minorities.

From such ruthless division of spoils another European conflict was as inevitable as the rising sun. Our people then refused to sanction that treaty. Our people now will not sanction any move by this country, directly or indirectly, to perpetuate its indefensible provisions at the point of the sword. I sincerely believe that the American people, when fully aware of the implications of this joint resolution, will demand immediate and complete protection against involvement in war. They have the right to and may well demand a popular expression on the question of our entrance into foreign wars of aggression.

THE PRESENT LAW NOT UNNEUTRAL

Who can fairly deny that this measure aims to give direct aid to one side of the present war? Strip it of its smoke screens, of the parts in which we are in practically unanimous agreement—the sections which protect our neutrality by limiting the activities of our nationals and shipping in combat zones and in financial commitments—and what is left? Merely a privilege accorded to nations on one side to obtain war weapons, munitions, and destructive implements to be used to wage their war and to maim and slaughter not only the soldiers and sailors of belligerents but, in all certainty, innocent noncombatant population as well.

TERRIBLE PROSPECTS OF RENEWED WARFARE

Who can have the slightest doubt that when this war starts in earnest, as it will if peace overtures are rejected, all restraints will be cast to the four winds, all rules of international law torn up as scraps of paper, as they always are in time of war? Who can doubt that when present time-marking ends and hostilities commence in earnest every weapon, every known device, every species of poison gas, disease-laden explosives, liquid fire, and other inhumane and torturous implements will be used by the belligerents against each other? Who can doubt that unrestricted submarine warfare will be waged by the Central Powers in a desperate effort to stem the stream of war implements and munitions destined to help the other side of this contest, which will flood the high seas as soon as the arms embargo is lifted?

Oh, yes; our munitions factories will hum with activity, profits will pour into the coffers of American bankers and industrialists, and after the war there will be another depression, but in Europe millions of youth will be decimated by these very weapons of death which our Government permits to be sent to help one side in this war, in the hope and with the intent of obliterating the other. Is this not mass murder? Is this not making our Nation a direct accessory to the slaughter of human beings, some of them innocent noncombatants?

The American people will resent, when they fully realize the results of repeal, a situation which makes their Government a direct accessory to the murder of millions of their fellow men, women, and children by bombs and airplanes labeled "Made in America."

NO NEUTRAL RIGHTS UNLESS COMPELLED BY FORCE

Much has been said in this debate about asserting our neutral rights under international law. Neither this Government nor any citizen or business interest thereof has any neutral right or any other kind of right, moral or legal, to trade with belligerents if that trade threatens to plunge this country into war. Neutral rights are no stronger than the will and power to enforce them when they are violated.

War suspends and vitiates neutral rights, because it abrogates international law, which is their sole sanction aside from direct force. Our World War experience taught us that bitter lesson. Let us not be again fooled by partisans and propaganda. We have our neutral duties, which are far more important to our people and the world than any neutral rights. These duties require us to shun and avoid any act or gesture indicating unneutrality which might by any circumstance involve us in war. They forbid us to become jingoists, or to put the proverbial chip on our shoulder.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SELLING ARMS AND OTHER SUPPLIES

It is argued, "Why should the United States forbid the shipment of arms and munitions, yet permit trade in cotton, iron, steel, and other supplies out of which arms and munitions can be made?" This argument is weak and technical. It does not strike at the root of this controversy. Bombs and shells, guns, airplanes, and other implements are used for only one purpose—war—killing and destroying. Cotton, iron, and steel and other supplies, while they may be used to make war weapons, are ordinarily used for a hundred peaceful purposes of life having no connection with war. In any event, I am not concerned about any inconsistency, implicit in this argument, as it affects my opposition to the repeal clauses, because I favor and would vote for the suspension of all trade with belligerents if that were necessary to prevent or minimize the chances of our involvement.

What difference will it make to the Central Powers, after the embargo is repealed, that these instruments of destruction were not carried in American ships? What difference does it make in the moral aspects of the question that only the belligerent ships of one side are permitted by this measure to bear munitions to the battlefields of Europe? Whether death-dealing weapons are transported in allied ships or in our own, they are destined to kill millions of young men, millions of innocent women and children, the aged, infirm, and helpless of Europe. Will the Central Powers consider how these munitions are sent to Europe, whether on American or on foreign ships? Or will they deeply resent the actual shipment as an act of discrimination and unneutrality—yes, hostility—and will they not move speedily and use every resource to cut off the supply of war weapons?

Let us contemplate now, not when it may be too late, the possible consequences of this repeal. I have no desire to overdraw the picture, but I desire to explore every possible eventuality.

RETALIATION WILL FOLLOW REPEAL

If the Central Powers come to despise and hate us for this unneutral position, is there any power on earth that will stay their fury and desperation to suppress these shipments at the source? This means submarine, even airplanes off our coast, outside our harbors, lying in wait for munition-laden ships, sinking them indiscriminately. It means convoys—battleships, destroyers, and other craft—vessels of war hounding our very shores to afford protection and escort to vessels bearing death and destruction to Europe. It means battles off our coasts, unrestricted submarine warfare, reprisals, retaliation, the destruction of ships carrying American citizens, the sinking of American ships by mistake, or in the very extreme of desperation without pains of identification, in order to cut off war supplies to our former Allies, which are dealing out death to the people of Central Europe, belligerents and noncombatants alike. It means bringing the European war right to our front door; it means incidents, a repetition of 1917, and finally war—war in which we ourselves will be involved—for the very same reasons and in the very same way that we were involved in 1917.

PREPARED FOR WAR?

Then what? Are we prepared for war? Are we doing enough in a constructive way to prepare for eventualities arising from this war to protect our shores and our homes? We are interested now, in my opinion, largely because of unrestrained sympathies and the lure of gain in sending to Europe war materials which we badly need for our own protection and our own adequate self-defense, which may embroil us in that war and make our whole country the mark

for foreign aggression, airplane attacks, internal sabotage, and disorder. But, as every Member of this body knows, we are totally unprepared to fight even a defensive war waged from the air by resourceful enemies which may occur under some conceivable circumstances from both sides of the American continent and from South America. We are totally and pitifully unprepared to wage a war of aggression to be carried on abroad, which would, as before, require transportation of millions of Americans to Europe.

WHAT PRICE GLORY?

In 1917-18 we transported millions of men to France in our own and allied ships. Many of them fought and died there. Many were maimed beyond recognition, and since have lived in suffering and isolation—the mental and physical black-outs of that war. We paid high prices to the Allies to carry these American boys across the seas to stave off certain allied defeat—"to save the world for democracy," as we were told. We even paid high rent for the trenches in which our gallant soldiers fought and died, and for the humble graves, marked with plain wooden crosses, in which our heroic dead lie buried. We did this with elaborate, combined convoys of American and allied battle craft.

NECESSITY FOR BUILDING STRONG SELF-DEFENSE

Instead of spending our time and energy in enacting legislation which will mark us as unneutral and partisan before the world, destroy our moral influence as neutrals, and ultimately surely involve us, we should be giving our attention to building up a strong, impregnable defense, an Army, Navy, and air force greater than any other in the world, a system of national defense embodying an enlarged Navy and Army, adequate coastal fortifications, antiaircraft guns and aircraft that will compel respect from all nations and insure complete protection against any eventuality which may develop out of the chaos and disorder of Europe and Asia. We may some day be the targets for all the maddened tyrants and militarists in the world. Let us be ready. If that happens, we shall all be proud to fight for our own country.

CREDIT AND CARRY REPLACES CASH AND CARRY

I wish to make brief reference to the credit provisions of this measure. We commenced with the doctrine of cash and carry—transfer of title and cash payment in the United States, transport by foreign ships. That was the propaganda to our people. Cash and carry is an insinuating phrase, a harmless, right-sounding phrase. To our people who did not stop to analyze it carefully, it appeared at first bluish a fair, impartial solution of our trade problem, if in time of war there is conceded to be a trade problem, if the question of profits out of war should ever be permitted serious consideration. But now our people have awakened to a full realization of some of the realities that would follow this proposal.

First, they observe the introduction of credit provisions. Secondly, they are disturbed about the cash features of the joint resolution. Where is the cash coming from? It was apparent to the international bankers, associated munition-maker industrialists, and sundry mercantile interests seeking profits out of war, that the cash of allied belligerents would not last very long after traffic in arms was legalized. These groups knew, and knew well, that the only resources the allied governments had in this country, apart from private holdings of their subjects, difficult to marshal, were a few hundred millions of dollars in earmarked gold. They were well aware that these sums were insignificant as compared with the incalculable amounts—the billions—required to finance a modern world war. The few hundred millions would be speedily exhausted, and then some other plan for transfer of title and purchase must be devised. Accordingly, the credit clause was inserted in this joint resolution, allowing purchases, transfer of title, and payment in 90 days. Thus this measure became not cash and carry but credit and carry. Now, as we approach a vote on the measure, this revised clause has been abandoned. There are strong reasons why it should be.

CREDITS WILL BE ULTIMATELY PAID BY AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

Any person conversant with international finance and the mechanics of international exchange knows that these credits

are a misnomer and a deceit; that after the first comparatively limited credits are discharged, the remainder never can and never will be paid. Were the World War debts paid? They were credits—credits negotiated to save the Allied Powers, extended at a time of crisis and great moment, when their very existence as independent nations was at stake. Were they ever redeemed? Of course not. Certain foreign governments have since boasted of their balanced budgets; but \$12,000,000,000 is still owed the United States since the last war, and is saddled as a permanent debt upon the backs of American taxpayers—ironic evidence of the kind of gratitude our Nation received for saving the Allies from extinction; brazen repudiation of just debts.

It is very easy, indeed, to balance a budget when you repudiate your debts, as our World War Allies have done. But the American taxpayer cannot follow this course. He must struggle and sacrifice to pay, not only to maintain necessary services of his own Government but also for repudiated credits which we gave the Allies in the World War.

CREDIT CLAUSE IS A MYTH—IT PROMOTES WAR

The 90-day credit clause in the joint resolution is a myth. The real result of this clause would be to place the burden of these credits—which would be repudiated and renounced, just as surely as those in the World War were defaulted—upon the American Government and the American taxpayers. There is only one way to accomplish that result unless we repeal the Johnson Act, which now prohibits loans to debtor nations, and that is to plunge the country into war. Then, as in the last war, we will underwrite the obligations of our allies, assume liability for their credits and loans from American bankers, and finance the entire cost of the war. That is the purpose, that is the design, that would be the inevitable result of the credit-and-carry provision. Its excision leaves of all the original contentious clauses only the arms embargo.

WHY PENALIZE AMERICAN SHIPPING INDUSTRY?

If we are going to sell arms to the Allies—and I oppose this policy with all my heart because I believe it means war—why penalize our own shipping industry? In the past, and even now, we have subsidized American shipping. If it is a question of "taking a chance" that deliveries can be made without mishap, which is to me incredible, why not give to American shipping interests, which may be ready and willing to take that chance, the privilege of gaining some of the profits of this nefarious traffic in arms?

If we permit such war supplies to be carried from our shores at all—and we are doing it by the terms of this joint resolution—it will make no difference whatever to the Central Powers whether they are carried in American or in foreign ships. In any event, many of the ships will be ruthlessly sunk, their cargoes and crews destroyed, and we shall get into this war just as easily and just as certainly, no matter which ships are sunk, because American citizens or American interests will be affected in either case, and the "overt act" of 1917, so ardently awaited now by some of our countrymen, will find a most acceptable and welcome repetition.

STRONG NATIONAL DEFENSE AND PEACE

Repeatedly I have stated my belief in a strong, impregnable national defense—a two-ocean navy exceeding in strength and modernity any other in the world, a mechanized, sizable, well-trained army, and a vast fleet of aircraft and skilled pilots, capable of combat on land and sea, which would serve as positive protection for America under any circumstances against any combination of powers. Whether or not we are going to war, let us be prepared to cope with any and all potential enemies.

But why go to war? Is it not unthinkable, unnecessary, futile, something to be shunned as the sting of death? Would it not be more in keeping with our traditions and ideals to promote international peace? Is it not appropriate that America, the stronghold of democracy, the citadel of individual liberty, the lover of humanity and champion of human freedom, should speak out, should cry out in protest against the continuance of bestial slaughter in Europe? While we are enacting this dangerous measure, pregnant with possibilities of gravest trouble for our country, can we not, in the

name of the Prince of Peace, speak one word for the cessation of hostilities?

This is not a time for petty feelings toward other nations, toward their beliefs, their forms of government, their differences of opinion with us, or objectives of theirs which we condemn. There is no action short of involving ourselves in this horrible war which we should not willingly take to bring peace again to the world. Can we not speak just once in the name of the poor and helpless of Europe who are making the supreme sacrifices to the god of war? At a time like this we should and must extend all possible good offices in a generous Christian spirit to the belligerent powers. Neither sympathies, personal differences with some nations, diplomatic niceties, or any other petty consideration should defer us from speaking for the cause of peace.

DUTY MORE COMPELLING THAN ANY OTHER CONSIDERATION

Above all, we must be resolute and determined not to be involved in this war, or any but a defensive war to save and protect our own Nation. I exceedingly regret that I must oppose the will of the administration on this question. But deep-seated convictions of conscience and duty must prevail over every other consideration.

As I am given the light to see it, the enactment of this joint resolution, and the events I believe are certain to follow, threaten war for my country. History is simply repeating itself. The days of 1917 are being reenacted. The draft law is already prepared. The blanks for the casualty lists are ready. The Government, finance, industry, all are in a war state of mind, ready to accept the inevitable.

One fact is clear: The great masses of our people hesitate and cringe from this terrifying eventuality. My first duty is not to any foreign government, foreign people, or foreign sympathy; not to any military conflict in Europe against dictators and tyrants, whose philosophies and methods I abhor and distrust. My first duty in this great crisis in our history is to the mothers and sons of America who would be—who will be, as I truly believe—the real victims and sufferers of war; to the youth, the citizens of tomorrow, the future torch-bearers of American democracy, who are already sufficiently beleaguered by economic misfortune, without marking them for slaughter. I can never cast my vote in this body to send a single American boy to death on a foreign battlefield in a war of aggression, or to bring a tear to the cheek of a single sorrowing, grief-stricken American mother. Treasure and manpower unstinted to defend our country from the unprovoked attacks of the war-crazed tyrants of the world, but not one penny, directly or indirectly, for foreign wars, foreign destruction, foreign slaughter of American youth.

Therefore, I shall vote against the repeal of the arms-embargo clauses of the pending measure.

[Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I must repeat the point of order which I have heretofore made, as I think it is my duty to do, that, under the rules of the Senate, demonstrations by occupants of the galleries are not permissible. I trust that not only will our guests observe the rule but that the Chair will enforce it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The point of order just made by the Senator from Kentucky is well taken. The occupants of the galleries are guests of the Senate, and common courtesy dictates that they should observe the rules of the Senate. The attendants in the galleries are directed to enforce the rules of the Senate.

Mr. MALONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Brown	Clark, Mo.	Gillette
Andrews	Bulow	Connally	Green
Austin	Burke	Danaher	Guffey
Bailey	Byrd	Davis	Gurney
Bankhead	Byrnes	Donahay	Hale
Barbour	Capper	Downey	Harrison
Barkley	Caraway	Ellender	Hatch
Bilbo	Chandler	Frazier	Hayden
Borah	Chavez	George	Herring
Bridges	Clark, Idaho	Gibson	Hill

Holman	McKellar	Pittman	Taft
Holt	McNary	Radcliffe	Thomas, Okla.
Hughes	Maloney	Reed	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Calif.	Miller	Reynolds	Townsend
Johnson, Colo.	Minton	Russell	Truman
King	Murray	Schwartz	Vandenberg
La Follette	Neely	Schwellenbach	Van Nuys
Lee	Norris	Sheppard	Wagner
Lodge	Nye	Shipstead	Walsh
Lucas	O'Mahoney	Slattery	Wheeler
Lundeen	Overton	Smathers	Wiley
McCarran	Pepper	Stewart	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I may first say I cannot believe that there is a Member of Congress more anxious to avoid war than am I.

I am not so presumptuous as to believe that what I now say will have any bearing upon the votes of Senators, or any great effect upon the viewpoint of my fellow Americans. I do, however, have a desire to express some of my own views on the important proposal under discussion.

Since I admit to myself that there is little likelihood of conversion to the views I hold, I speak with the hope that my contribution to this important debate will in some degree tend to bring a greater calm to the people of the country, and especially to the constituency which I have the honor, in part, to represent.

My own mind is clear, and my conscience is now directing me without the slightest hesitation. I must frankly say that I should prefer that I had never been called upon to vote on this measure, but I hasten to add that I do it with no doubt of my duty.

It seems to me, and my prayers go with the thought, that there is still some hope for an early peace in Europe. I do not mean that I want to see peace at any price, because to me liberty is still sweeter than life; and until the uncertainties of an Old World gone mad can be adjusted with a reasonable assurance of enduring peace and calm, and until the wrongs are righted, those people who are suffering the bitterness of the struggle are in a better position to try to work out their salvation than are we.

I want to see a peace without indemnity—other than the restorations of the rights which have been taken away—and with no other or greater demands than that all the nations disarm, that the world may at long last live in enduring peace. I want to see no peoples destroyed.

We are not now dealing with a political question, Mr. President. This momentous problem does not in any sense call for the following of a party, the President, or congressional leadership, or the views of a sincere and articulate but not major part of the people we represent. The crying need of the moment is a leadership of conscience, and the demand of the hour that we do what is best for America and humanity. It seems to me we betray ourselves and our country, and our people and humanity, if we hesitate to do what we think is right because we fear to create hard feelings, or fear to trespass upon the views of men who themselves have been viciously careless of the comfort and happiness and rights of those about them.

We cannot worry about what some people in a distant land think of our action here. We have the solemn obligation of doing what appears to be the right thing, though it may seem to tread upon the feelings of some of those across the seas.

This is not a game, Mr. President. We are dealing with a consideration of the horrors and the cruelties of war. We are not bound by rules of a game. International law, as we so bitterly learned in the last war, is just about what powerful governments say it is; and, while I do not think the pending joint resolution in any way affects international law, I wish someone would tell me how we should undertake to repeal an international law which has been carelessly conceived.

Our first duty in this instance is to "mind our own business," and minding our own business means affording a protection to our people, a protection against war, a protection against the staining of our national honor, a protection against loss of the high moral code that has endured for a century and a half, and a protection against the abandonment of Christian ideals. Government is instituted to protect

its own people, and, as I see it, that government is cowardly which sacrifices its moral and spiritual values, or the protection of its homes and firesides, because of a fear that it will offend the hopes of rulers beyond its own dominion. Heaven knows that they have not worried about their offenses against us.

At the moment some good people of our country are going through a period of hysteria. Added up, or boiled down, however, the unanimous desire and demand is that we take the path away from war. Men's minds are confused, and the noble, tear-stained, heavy-hearted women of our country, hateful and fearful of war, cannot banish the fear that their sons and loved ones may be called away. It seems to me that this feeling has been to some extent unnecessarily magnified, and, reluctant as I am to say it, that men in high places have unintentionally contributed to the fear. I have felt, Mr. President, and now feel, that some statements have been too intense for safety and comfort, and that while both sides of the debate have been logical to a degree, there has been a carelessness of overstatement which has helped to create heartaches in the homes of the great and the humble.

It is my opinion that the pending measure will in no way increase the danger to us, while almost all admit that there are features of it which add to our protection against war. With portions of the measure I am not in agreement. I believe that in its present form it tends to stifle our merchant marine, and unnecessarily demands sacrifices on the part of American business, and seafaring men, which should at least be lessened. On the other hand, I do not believe that it goes far enough in connection with the matter of payments by those to whom we sell our produce and our products. We should be paid in advance of their shipment. No goods sold to warring nations should go in our ships or in our name. American ships and American people should travel in known danger zones at their own risk, and while such a policy may be a partial surrender of our rights, we must recognize the realities of war. No man, or group of men, should expect his countrymen to share the risks of his quest for profit or adventure. I shall help in the effort safely to liberalize the proposal in the first instance, and to strengthen it in the second.

Lest I be misunderstood, however, let me say clearly that I share the heretofore expressed opinion that the time for legalistic hair-splitting has gone, and all things taken into account, it is clear to me how I shall finally vote.

Like other Members of Congress, I have undergone harsh criticism, and have suffered political threat. Like other Senators, I have neither the time nor desire to take into account the possible personal after effects. I took my oath here with all of the sincerity with which I am endowed.

When a constituent of mine or an occasional constituent of another Senator writes me that he "wants no war," or "wants no blood money," or that Members of Congress "should not harken to the pleas of the munition makers" or "the war mongers," I know that I cannot easily make him understand that I feel just as he does unless I am willing to vote as he asks me to vote. I am sufficiently enlightened to know that there is no present argument against his feeling. Men and women who write in that tone and in that vein are expressing a conviction, and convictions are ever so slowly set aside. I know that the people who feel so intensely on this measure may one day put into effect the threats they have made, but to act otherwise than in accordance with one's judgment and conscience would be as a man washing his hands in the face of the possible threat of Christianity's crucifixion. The European war involves a threat to religion and, as a consequence, to the dignity of man, and it behooves us to be certain that we do not give impetus to the threat by our failure to correct an unfair and unneutral situation which we ourselves created. Whether or not religion was threatened, our duty would be the same; but I point to the true state of affairs fully to emphasize the seriousness of our responsibility.

I have listened as consistently and intently as possible to all of the debate up to this time. I have been attentive to the interesting discussions on the radio, and to the extent

that the hours of the day would permit I have hungrily read everything written on the subject by outstanding students and observers. Let me say, Mr. President, that up to this very moment I have yet to find that Senators opposing the proposal of the Foreign Affairs Committee have logically linked their fear to how we might possibly enter this war. What they have done, however—unintentionally, of course—is to give force to the idea prevailing in some minds that the vote on the pending measure is in effect a vote on the question of whether or not we are to go to war. There are persons who firmly believe that Senators who vote "yea" on this proposal are actually taking the first step toward sending young Americans to fight. Some Senators believe that. They have come no closer to a logical argument, however, than an inference that we will suffer an attack over here.

To me that argument is fantastic. I have patiently waited for an argument which might, even to a slight degree, strengthen the contention that the passage of the joint resolution would be the first step toward war. That presentation is still delayed, and my own conviction becomes the stronger. Let me say again, however, that we should demand cash for what we sell, in order to avoid the possibility of misleading anyone in Europe.

Let me say at this time, Mr. President, that if there is reason for any nations in Europe to believe, or to entertain the serious hope, that at some later date we may enter this war, no ground for such belief has been afforded by those who favor repealing the arms embargo. The encouragement, if there is any—and I hope there is none—has been given, unintentionally, of course, by those who are opposed to the pending measure.

Let me serve notice, if my feeble voice can in any degree serve notice, that we will not later treat seriously any cry that we were willing to sell munitions abroad for a profit while there was cash, but would refrain from selling them when cash was exhausted. I want to make that statement clear, so I shall take the time here and now briefly to reexplain my view on that part of the joint resolution which is the real bone of contention.

I think that, insofar as the question of the arms embargo is concerned, the United States is confronted with a moral responsibility. When I say that, I speak my own views. I know that some Senators anxious to support the Foreign Affairs Committee have an especial desire to give what help they can, short of America's participation in the war, to the nations which are generally regarded as being on the defensive. I cannot harshly criticize them because moral values were cast aside with the destruction of the none-too-powerful little countries of Europe. Granting that those who were at Versailles committed sins against themselves and the world, and sorrowful as we were and still are that they neglected the admonition and pleading of our great national leadership, is there one who will say that the way to set aside what was done at Versailles is by bombing defenseless women and children? Is there one who will insist that the errors of that faulty conference table justified the death of thousands of German young men, and the lives, hopes, and aspirations of Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Poland?

I mention this that I may let it be known that I understand the feeling expressed by other men. That, however, is not the feeling directing my vote.

During the days just behind us I have listened to Senators tell of the black marks on the record of the British Government. Theirs was not a new story to me. All my life I have heard of Britain's persecution of God-fearing and God-loving people. Almost by heart I know the whole story of those subjected to the violent dictation of England's might. My abhorrence of the dark shadows which British leaders have cast upon decent governmental practice has been as violent as England's rule; but I am not so blind as not to know that the English people were not to blame. What the governments of England have done has little bearing upon the present plight of the people of England, or the people of France, or Canada, any more than the good people of Germany, or other nations of the world, can properly be held responsible for the mad aims and doings of a leadership

which has shackled them. I insist that we have a moral responsibility to people defending their homes and the lives of their children, because we willingly sold munitions of war to those who have become aggressors, while the present defenders suffered humiliation and sacrifice in an effort to preserve peace and to avoid war.

I point out that under existing law we may sell 10,000 bombing planes to Communistic Russia, but we are compelled to deny to friendly and neighborly Canada the right to purchase a revolver. Mr. President, if I may use the words of a distinguished Senator who has spoken heretofore, "It just doesn't make sense." I am firmly convinced that we should now place at the disposal of these defending people, who have been trying to travel the path of peace, weapons of defense which are still available to their adversaries—not directly available, Mr. President, but indirectly available.

On that simple contention I rest my case and explain my vote.

With respect to the parts of the joint resolution outside of the arms-embargo provision, there is no need for me to take up the time of the Senate to dwell upon its safeguarding features. They are pretty freely admitted by the opponents of the measure. I go on with my remarks only for the reason heretofore given—that I hope to contribute to the comfort and calm of men and women everywhere, and of the boys at school, who, because they love life and want to live it through in a normal way, suffer the fright that is ever present when war clouds gather.

Mr. President, I have lived my life the hard way. I have the firm feeling that the bond of love may be a little more closely knit in the oil-lamp-lighted home, and that the capacity for worry is greater there. My feeling that this is true is based upon the certain knowledge that persons in less fortunate economic circumstances live closer to one another, and that their daily contact makes the threat of the absence of their loved ones more painful to anticipate. I do not mean that love is less strong in the homes of more fortunate persons, but I am confident that the capacity for fear is not so great, and that under stress the emotion is not so strong. Through the Senate I want to address myself to those persons, with the fervent hope that they will find some comfort in my statement.

Mr. President, there is occasion for fear on the part of Americans. There is a reason for a remote fear that we may one day become involved in the war. But the danger is not in the joint resolution, Mr. President. You know, as I do, that the Congress will never take the American people to war, and that the President of the United States cannot take them to war. Perhaps sometime in the future, as was the case in the past, for some reason yet unseen, the American people will decide to take Congress and the President and themselves to war. Personally, I doubt it.

I doubt it, first, because I do not think the war will be of long duration; and next, because I believe we will mind our own business and strengthen our armaments; and that, wild as they may be, the warmakers and the mad warriors of other places will let us alone. We should, however, know that while we can insulate ourselves insofar as mortal combat is concerned, there is another danger. We are certain to feel the economic effects of even a short war in Europe. Our business is bound eventually to suffer.

During the war there is certain to be an artificial stimulation which will give work to American men and acceleration to American business. So let us remember, Mr. President, that America must pursue its way of life when the war business is no more—and may God speed the day! At that point, if the war trade has been heavy, there is danger of a collapse. War profits would then be as worthless as the sands of the Sahara, and then would we suffer the effects of other men's madness and misfortune. We may not be able to avoid such a consequence, although the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has given us a plan for consideration. It will not be munitions sales that will build a war business, but rather the sale of the other produce and products of our country. We cannot escape those sales; but let none for a moment suppose that there is no great danger to our national economy.

I say again, however, that that danger is in no way connected with the joint resolution.

It has been pointed out in the debate by one distinguished Senator after another that if we should enter the war we would suffer regimentation and probably repudiation, as well as deflation. Let no one mistake the possible accuracy of those statements. If we should enter the war, we probably could not escape the dangers referred to; but if our Congress and our country will return to a reasonable calm and maintain American courage, there will be no regimentation, because we will not go to war.

The entire Senate is a peace bloc, and will not vote for war except in defense of the United States.

Let the American people keep in mind that some Members of Congress are not beyond the age of participation in war, and let them remember that ever so many Members of Congress have boys of wartime age.

For these reasons alone, and because every man of decency sees other peoples' children through the beautiful picture of his own children, he is not knowingly going to do a thing that would hurt a single American home. It will be ever so much better if everyone will view our problems realistically rather than by way of the stars and the promotion of fear.

I am now about to include in my statement something that may be a bit unusual. I do not intend to commit any Senator by this statement, and I do not know for a certainty who among us will support the pending joint resolution. I have no greater authority for my assumption than information which has come to me by way of the newspapers. The newspapers have given a list of the names of Senators said to be in sympathy with the measure offered by the committee. I have not asked a single Senator how he intended to vote, nor has any Senator asked me how I intend to vote; so if I seem to misplace someone I trust that I may be excused.

Senators favoring this measure, or at least some of them, have been described as interventionists. I do not think that the word was used in a derogatory manner, but when men are called interventionists, and in the same speech the belief is expressed that the enactment of this joint resolution would be the first step toward war, I want to give the people of the country a chance to know more about the interventionists.

I desire that the people know just how much of a personal interest the so-called interventionists would have in a war.

For the comfort of the fathers and mothers of young men of wartime age, let me give them a word picture of the effect that war would have upon Members of the United States Senate. My statement may not be entirely accurate, although I think it is. It should not only prove of tremendous interest to the people of the United States, but I think that it will give them some degree of consolation as they worry about the future of their own children.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS] has two sons of military age.

The senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] has one son who has already taken the oath of the Army.

The senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has two sons of military age, both of whom are at the present time Reserve officers.

The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] has two sons of military age.

The senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has one son of war-service age.

The junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] has a son who is a first lieutenant in the Army.

The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has sons of war-service age.

The senior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the only mother in the Senate, has two sons who are now in the Army and would be subject to immediate war service.

The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] is a Reserve captain in the Army of the United States.

The junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who, like many other of his colleagues, was an officer in the World War, has a son of military age.

The majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] has a son of military age who is at the present time a Reserve officer in the Flying Corps, and subject to call.

The junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has a son of military age.

The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has one son who is a naval aviator and another son of military age.

The junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON] is himself a member of the Army Reserve and has two sons who are Reserve officers.

The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has two sons of military age.

The junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] has five nephews subject to call if war should come.

The junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] has four nephews subject to Army call.

The junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], while he has no sons of immediate wartime age, has two boys whose ages put them immediately in the shadow of war should war come.

The senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has a son of military age.

The senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] has a son subject to call.

The junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING] has one son who is a lieutenant in the Reserve and subject to immediate call, and three sons of military age.

The junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES] has a son of military age.

The senior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has sons of military age and had a son who was an aviator in the World War.

The junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] is not blessed with sons, but his daughter's husband is a Reserve officer and would be among the first to go if we were so unfortunate as to be engaged in war.

The junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE] has a son approaching the age at which he would be called to military service.

The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is now a colonel in the Illinois National Guard and served in the last war.

The junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] has a son of military age.

The junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON] has a son of military age, two approaching the age of military service, and is himself a member of the Army Reserve Corps.

There are comparatively few people in the country who, in the event of war, would be threatened with a greater sacrifice than would the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. He has five sons of military age.

The senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] has two sons of military age.

The junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] has a son of military age.

The junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ] has three sons of military age.

The junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SLATTERY] has one son who is a lieutenant in the Illinois National Guard and four sons of military age.

The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] has two sons in military school who will be of military-service age next year.

The senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] has two sons of military age.

The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] has two sons of military age.

The junior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is himself subject to call to military service, and the husbands of two of his daughters are subject to a call to service in the event of war.

The senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] has sons of military age.

The junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] has four nephews subject to call in the event of war, and is himself a Reserve officer in the field artillery.

The senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] has a son of military age.

The senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a son of military age.

This does not cover all of those whom the newspapers have stated will vote for the repeal of the arms embargo; but, Mr. President, it is a sufficient list to let the people of the country know that the majority of the Senators of the United States Senate do not feel that the passage of this bill would be the first step toward war.

Sacrifices here would be just as great as in other places, and the homes of the Senators, in the event of war, would be as saddened as the homes of other men.

Mr. President, I, too, am among the Members of Congress with small children, and I have a son who was born in the early afterglow of the World War. At no time during these difficult days have I for a moment been unmindful of the sacrifice his mother would be called upon to make, or his own sacrifice, were the worst to come. Let no one suppose that Members of Congress are different than other people, nor that to them anything else, even life itself, is so sweet as the happiness and preservation of their children.

As I expose my feelings and tell the Senate that, as I see it, this joint resolution is the way of honest neutrality, I do not intend to be critical of the views of those men who want to help the defending nations. I am not trying to avoid the animosity of anyone by way of this speech. I fully understand that in a heterogeneous country such as ours there are some few with a natural fatherland sympathy that they cannot abandon. National sympathies, like religious sympathies, are bound to play a part in the lives of men, especially during periods of stress, and there will be those who conscientiously believe that the leaders in this war have justification for their aggression. They will point to the flaws in the Treaty of Versailles, and they will remember the beauties of their homeland, and many of them may convince themselves that the leaders of their former country cannot be wrong. A national allegiance which is in the blood will not be easily absorbed, so, lest it be thought that I seek the absolution of these people for the step I take, let me make it clear that I am hateful of that leadership which denies men the comfort of their religion, and the consolation of the communion with God that came to them at their mother's knee.

The successful march of the pagan doctrine of certain world leaders would soon destroy our civilization, because without religion God is not closely at hand, and the loss of religion means the ultimate destruction of the dignity of His image and likeness. Without God and a confidence in the everlasting beauties of eternity life becomes meaningless, and when men become subservient to a state to the neglect of the adoration of God and the neglect of His teachings, the end is at hand.

None will deny that the successes of the marching armies might easily result in a devastating spread of the pagan teachings destructive of the devotion to God, which has endured for centuries.

Ireland has been mentioned in this debate. What of Ireland, where religion is so precious that it is made paramount in that country's constitution, and where uncounted thousands have died for their faith and their liberty? Will one say that the Baltic and Balkan states and the other small countries of the Old World could escape the dominating influence of the mighty ones?

So let my position be clearly understood. I want the Allied armies to resist defeat. I do not want any countries destroyed, nor the homes of the German people emptied of their youth.

I do not clamor for a bloody victory for the armies of England and France, but I hope they will be saved from defeat, because their leaders profess and practice a way of life more clearly in keeping with the divine teachings, and because in those countries freedom of thought and worship and expression still prevail.

Mr. President, the original so-called Neutrality Act was drafted because we were fearful of war. It was not carefully drafted, because war was not then at hand. Some of us

now insist that it was a grievous mistake, and that, in effect, it is not a neutrality proposal. Let us not be ashamed to admit the mistake we made nor to right the wrong that came as a result of our mistake.

Mr. President, there are at the present moment Members of the Senate convinced that we need a great program of rearmament who just a little while ago scorned the suggestion, and said it was wasteful to build battleships or buy planes. Now they would change. Is that "changing the rules during the game," or after war is started? Not at all. It is changing our policy, at least for them, and not a soul would criticize their new viewpoint.

Mr. President, I am not for a moment fearful of offending anyone in Europe. I dislike to offend people of other countries, and so long as I could I remained still, but when the issue is presented I know that the way toward peace is not the cowardly way. Let me point out that all of the people of Europe, and more especially the leaders of government there, had a notice of the aims of our national leadership before they marched. They knew, just as every Member of Congress knew, that this so-called neutrality proposal was only temporarily set aside when we left for a recess early in August. They must have known that we would be back, because they must have known that our legislation had weakened certain nations, and that there was a determination on the part of some Americans that we would not knowingly continue to condemn people to a weakened defense because of our earlier misguided noble intentions.

I think my heart bleeds a little for the fears of American mothers, and more particularly for those mothers whose boys were born during the last war, or during the immediate dark shadows cast by that war. I can understand the feeling of their plea that "you must keep us out of war." God knows that every Member of this Congress is just as firmly imbued with that desire and intention as they are, and that we are being guided by the light He has given us in this hour of vicissitude. I do not believe our boys will participate in this war, or that they will ever engage in any war across the seas, except by direction of the vote of the American people. On that I shall say "no."

I want to emphasize the fact that in all of our history we have never been guilty of shady diplomacy, and that with God's help we will not now resort to it. For that reason, let us make it clear that we do not want the defeat of the Allies; but also let us make it clear that because we, as a nation, have lived the right way, we do not feel that there is a single compelling reason for adding our boys to the sacrifice that the Allies might be called upon to make. We owe nothing to the nations of Europe. We owe something to humanity, and we want to see religion preserved, and we want to keep faith with the teachings of 2,000 years, but we at the moment; and I hope in all of the after moments, have a deep and fixed feeling that we have earned the right to peace in the United States. Excepting in defense of our homes and our national honor, we will preserve it.

I know little of international law, and that does not matter much at the moment, because my principal interest in law right now is a matter of home protection. It takes a strong national courage to take a firm position on any matter concerning war; but I believe that the position directed by this proposed legislation, in spite of the attack made upon it by people of good intentions, is not only the way of righteousness, but the way of peace and protection.

President Roosevelt has insisted that he is hateful of war, and will avoid this one; and the man is low of character or intellect who really believes that any President of this great Nation would take his countrymen to war for political gain. I believe the President. I am as certain as I can be that his desire for peace is not less than that of any one of our people. I believe it is stronger than that of most men, because the President has known a greater suffering than most men, and he has proven his devotion to the cause of the suffering.

Mr. President, the United States is still a land of rich opportunity. We are blessed with great wealth, and are endowed with noble traditions and institutions. Most precious of our possessions is liberty; and I want to lay emphasis upon

the fact that if we falter in our own faith we endanger liberty. If we see a moral obligation and fail to face it, be certain that it will torment us in the days ahead. There are those who say that we should remain entirely aloof, so that when we are finally permitted to look upon the dying ashes of the fires now raging in Europe we shall be in a better position to help toward a proper settlement and lasting peace. I want to remain aloof. I share their view; but I insist, Mr. President, that if we do not maintain our splendid background of courage and decency, or if we back up too far in the face of a fear that we offend some one, we may be lacking in the necessary strength when the peaceful day does come. I refuse to look at this situation through dark glasses. I prefer to see it in the light of my conscience, with a begging plea that you believe me when I tell you that I hate and fear war as much as any man can.

I am old enough to remember the saddened hours of 1917, and I know that we cannot completely erase sadness and fear so long as there is mortal conflict in Europe; but I say to you, and I just as strongly beg you to believe, Mr. President, that America cannot fail to do right because of a fear of an audacious leadership elsewhere. Our leadership is here.

Europe's need is for spiritual rearmament. Though those there may not like what we do, we can set them an example by doing what they know is right, even though they temporarily hate us for it. If we made a grievous error—and I think we did—it should be corrected even after what some men call a "game" has started. We are not making new rules. We are not associated with this controversy because we want to be. If certain powers may hate us because we pass this measure, is there not a greater reason for other powers to hate us if we fail to do it? Have we any right to believe that by evading a responsibility we should contribute to the cause of peace?

As I conclude my statement, I want to try to leave the thought with those who do me the honor to listen that while I have little fear of war for us, regardless of how Congress finally acts, there is much at stake. We cannot be entirely certain that we are right. Only God knows that. There are no omniscient men among us; and something may happen, even tomorrow, that will make us wish we had longer delayed. We are compelled to act in the light of this day's sun and to meet the situation as it arises. It seems to me that our duty now is to unshackle the greatest power in the world.

I find comfort in the certain feeling that the overwhelming majority of the American people are in sympathy with this proposal, and supporting their national leadership, and want us to do what our Foreign Relations Committee recommends. I find comfort in reports that the overwhelming majority of our newspapers, our Governors, and our writers and teachers are supporting this proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD at this point a copy of a Gallup poll published last Sunday which seems to bear out my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Idaho in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

REPEAL OF EMBARGO FAVORED IN SURVEY—GERMAN-ORIGIN CITIZENS ALONE OPPOSE ARMS PLAN

A majority of American voters of all national origins save those of German origin are in favor of repealing the arms embargo, according to an analysis of the voting in a survey by the American Institute of Public Opinion, of which Dr. George Gallup is director. The survey continues:

"Interesting enough, however, nearly half (45 percent) of those with opinions who identified themselves as first- or second-generation German-Americans said they would like to see the Neutrality Act changed. This would permit England, France, and other possible belligerents with control of the seas to purchase war supplies in the United States, while Germany, presumably, would not be able to do so.

"In its continuous studies of public opinion on the question now before Congress, the institute has asked persons in every State: 'In what country was your father born?' This has permitted a correlation with the replies to the neutrality question itself: 'Do you think Congress should change the neutrality law so that England, France, or any other nation can buy war supplies here?'

"Citizens of British, Canadian, and Russian origin are most in favor of changing the Neutrality Act's ban on arms, the survey shows. The Russian-American group undoubtedly includes many

persons whose religious sympathies incline them to oppose the Nazi regime.

The results, when correlated, are as follows:

	For repealing arms embargo	For keeping arms embargo
Father born in—	Percent	Percent
United States.....	60	40
Great Britain.....	68	32
Russia.....	67	33
Ireland.....	60	39
Canada.....	60	40
Italy.....	55	45
Germany.....	45	55
All others.....	58	42
National average.....	60	40

"Another interesting vote is the Italian. Although Mussolini's Italian state has been closely bound to Germany by the Rome-Berlin axis, the survey indicates that a majority of Italo-Americans would like to see the Allies receive the war supplies they need in their war with the German Reich.

"Irish-Americans represented a source of anti-British sentiment in the last World War, but apparently they are much closer to Canadian-Americans in their attitudes today than they are to German-Americans.

"The survey adds considerable new evidence to what is known about the various nationality groups in the United States at this time. In a previous institute survey reported last week, little difference was found among all such groups on the question of sending American troops abroad to join the Allies."

Mr. President, peace will come to Europe again. Peace will come, because the peoples of the Old World will insist upon peace. We shall help them to insist upon it if we now admit our mistake and correct a wrong.

Some of them may hope that we will join the war on their side, but down in their hearts they will not expect that we will do more than be fair with them and be honest with ourselves. Our duty is to write a law to fit our own needs of protection and to preserve our high code of honor as a nation, as we pray for world peace. Let me say that weakness does not bring peace, whether it be weakness in arms and ships or in morality. Let the American people know that the measure we debate does not bring us one step toward war, that in a large measure it insulates our country against war, and that at the same time it restores our high standards of fairness and real neutrality. Let the nations of Europe understand that we are not taking sides. Let them understand as well that we are without fear, and that if, as a result of this measure, they should intensify a campaign of discord in our country, which in some instances has long been under way, we shall punish those responsible.

I have tried, Mr. President, in simple language, to set forth my innermost feelings. I want to say again and again that I hope that the Christian beliefs and practices of Europe will be saved, and that the courageous Polish people and the Czechoslovakian nation, and the other stricken countries, will again live under their own flags.

Mr. President, as I vote "yea" on this proposal, it will be on the basis of what I feel is our moral obligation; the way I think best for my country. I want to unshackle the United States. I want to prove to the rest of the world that we are not lacking in moral values, and that while we have a strong national, naval, and military defense, we will likewise keep our spiritual armament strong and untarnished. This is a measure to maintain America's integrity and to keep us at peace.

I pray that the German people may be saved, because their destruction will not bring back the brave soldiers and civilians of Poland. Those people are now in God's care. The living He intrusts to our care, by way of His having endowed men with an everlasting free will. He taught us not to hate men. He taught us to do right, and showed us the way of peace. As He is my judge, Mr. President, I solemnly and firmly believe that in voting for this joint resolution we do right, and that in voting for it we take what seems to me to be the shortest path to peace. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. DANAHER obtained the floor.

Mr. AUSTIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Andrews	Davis	King	Reynolds
Austin	Donahay	La Follette	Russell
Bailey	Downey	Lee	Schwartz
Bankhead	Ellender	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Frazier	Lucas	Sheppard
Barkley	George	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bilbo	Gibson	McCarran	Slattery
Borah	Gillette	McKellar	Smathers
Bridges	Green	McNary	Stewart
Brown	Guffey	Maloney	Taft
Bulow	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Okla.
Burke	Hale	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Harrison	Murray	Townsend
Byrnes	Hatch	Neely	Truman
Capper	Hayden	Norris	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herrington	Nye	Van Nuys
Chandler	Hill	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chavez	Holman	Overton	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Pittman	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there can be little doubt in the minds of those of us who have listened to the stirring address just delivered by my colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], that it was one of the most eloquent and moving of the contributions to this debate. There can be no question in the minds of any of us of his complete good faith and his deep sincerity in the position which he has announced. I have not the capacity to urge upon the Senate the position which I take with such a wealth of oratory, with the bouquets of speech we have heard from the lips of my colleague. I am proud of him; I believe that all of us well might be.

I am just practical enough, however, in my approach to the question before us, to urge an answer to such a step as was pointed out by my colleague, and by others who have spoken in favor of repeal of the embargo on arms, who point out that under the present law arms and munitions and implements of war might be sent to Italy or to Russia, perchance, and therefore say, why should we have a law which will permit that?

Mr. President, I am just practical enough, if I may again use the term, to say, we do not have to permit that. All we have to do is to amend our existing law and forbid the exportation of munitions and implements of war to those neutrals. That is all there is to it. That is all that is involved in the matter.

Two weeks ago we heard the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations tell the Senate that the pending joint resolution must be passed without amendment. That suggested to those of us who would recall the days of the so-called spending-lending bill in July how, first, the country had been treated to a discourse that we were to have a self-liquidating projects bill before us, that we were to have something which was not to cost the people any money. But after the debate had proceeded for a few days, all pretext about self-liquidating projects was abandoned, and the bill came out in a new form, being known as the works refinancing measure.

Senators will remember the steps taken thereafter. They will recall how we undertook to dissect the bill to see what its effect would be. First, out came the section dealing with highways. Next, out came the section which would have to do with railroad-equipment trusts and refunding ventures. Before the consideration of the bill was concluded it looked like the sieve it was intended to be in the first place, and it went, properly, to its complete and ultimate defeat.

We have been told that the pending joint resolution contained a cash-and-carry plan. We were told, and the public heard for weeks, that the road to security lay in repealing the embargo on arms and the adoption of a cash-and-carry plan. Yet on the 11th of October the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE] announced his intention of voting for the joint resolution, and he said that, speaking for himself, he wanted to vote for the joint resolution because he

wanted to assist Great Britain and France. But in his conclusion he said he wanted to vote for the joint resolution because it contained a cash-and-carry provision. I asked him if he would yield, and asked him if he would point out wherein in the joint resolution there was the requirement that even 5 cents of cash were to be paid.

There is no cash-and-carry plan in the measure now, and there was not then. The distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska was not able to put his finger upon any such provision, and he said:

Without having the joint resolution before me, I cannot refer to the exact provisions; but I will direct the Senator's attention to them. He has read them word for word. Does not the joint resolution provide for the passage of title to goods in this country sold to belligerents?

Mr. DANAHER. It does.

Mr. BURKE. What does that involve?

Mr. DANAHER. I want to know if the Senator was basing his remarks with respect to cash and carry on section 2 (c), which appears on page 16, which is the provision which has to do with the passage of title.

Mr. BURKE. That is certainly one of the provisions. If the Senator will tell me what he has in mind, I am sure the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] can answer the question.

So the junior Senator from Nebraska referred the question to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and I answered:

I shall be very happy if I may have the answer from the Senator from Nevada.

The Senator from Nevada took the floor, whereupon the Senator from Nebraska said he would yield the floor.

When the Senator from Nevada was hard pressed to point out wherein there were any cash-and-carry provisions in the measure in view of the fact that our presence on the floor had depended entirely on that which had been yielded by the Senator from Nebraska, the alert junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], raised a point of order, and took us both off the floor. I requested that the RECORD show that my question was not answered, and at page 293 the RECORD discloses that I said:

May I have it noted in the RECORD that the question propounded by me has not been answered?

Oh, we got the answer, Mr. President. We got it yesterday. The senior Senator from Nevada, who 2 weeks ago had a measure which would not require amendment, came in yesterday with an amendment. He took out the specious, spurious representation of a cash-and-carry plan which was involved in section 7 (a). His amendment is on Senators' desks today. That is the first of the amendments. It has to do with the first of the items which must be corrected. The public, which has been told all over the country for weeks that there was a cash-and-carry provision in this measure, and that it was to be found in section 7 (a), finds the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee himself admittedly amending the measure on his own motion to take out the very section which up to now he has purported to favor.

Mr. President, there has been no adequate revision of section 7 (b) of the measure; but we will come back to that in due course, I can assure you.

As I stated earlier, I am just practical enough in my approach to this question to point out that there is serious agitation upon the part of some Senators to amend the measure to permit American shipping to ply the seas. The present law does not inhibit American shipping in the particulars which are sought by the amendments which are to be offered or have been offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. There is not any limitation under our present law which would restrict the Senator from North Carolina, and all others interested, in achieving the objective sought by his proposed amendment, or prevent them from getting those very results under the law as it is now on our books.

Mr. President, the point is this. Our present law forbids American vessels to carry arms to belligerents. That is true. That is the way we want it to be. The present law, on the other hand, does not forbid our taking goods to South Africa

or to Australia. It is the pending measure which would do that. It is the spurious idea of protection which has been held out to the American public, as being involved in this measure which does that.

Mr. President, do the people of the United States know that a soap manufacturer in Cleveland, Ohio, cannot send his own soap to another factory he owns in Canada? Do they realize that under the pending measure an American granary cannot send its own grain to its own warehouse in Canada? Under the law which is on the books it can.

All those things were deliberated upon in considered, calm judgment, over a period of years, while this legislation grew and took form. All these items were canvassed, and when the neutrality measures were passed, both in 1935 and in 1937, all these things were taken care of, and they are in our law today for the full and complete protection of the American public.

It seems to me that perhaps I might open up a new subject for the consideration of the Senate. I suppose that Senators, and indeed the public, at least would like to know what protection our present law gives them. I suppose there are those who would like to know just exactly what they are asked to repeal.

Mr. President, in considering House Joint Resolution 306, we should recall that the first and immediate effect if it shall pass will be to repeal the act of August 31, 1935, as amended, the act of May 1, 1937, and the act of January 8, 1937. Before we even contemplate taking off the old and putting on the new, the very least we should do is to ascertain what is provided in the legislation now upon our statute books. This legislation was not hastily enacted but was the outgrowth of many years of considered judgment. It was designed to insure the peace and safety of the United States and of her citizens in the event of a war between other nations. In those particulars in which trial and experience suggested that reasonable legislative safeguards should be corrected for our greater security, amendments were adopted in 1936 and again in 1937. Yet by the pending measure the whole group of statutes constituting the bulk of our law on the subject would be repealed.

The original act was entitled:

Joint resolution providing for the prohibition of the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries; the prohibition of the transportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war by vessels of the United States for the use of belligerent states; for the registration and licensing of persons engaged in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing arms, ammunition, or implements of war; and restricting travel by American citizens on belligerent ships during war.

That was the title of the act we adopted in 1935. Nor was the title varied when Public Resolution No. 27 was adopted in 1937. There was at no time a claim that the passage of such legislation constituted an assertion of neutrality, nor was the expected or intended purpose of the legislation such as to promote neutrality. Quite the contrary, the legislation upon our books very definitely constituted a statement of policy, a policy which among other points was intended to prohibit the export of munitions to belligerent countries. That was what the Congress decided, that was what the people of the United States wanted, and that is what the President of the United States approved.

When the amendment in the nature of a substitute was filed in the Seventy-sixth Congress, it is interesting to perceive that the proposed resolution, in essence the same as is now before us, was entitled "The Peace Act of 1939." Nobody then called it a Neutrality Act. When this legislation now upon our books was adopted the plain purpose was to make unlawful the export of arms, ammunition, or implements of war to any belligerent state named in the President's proclamation or "to any neutral state for transshipment of, or for the use of any such belligerent state." Also, the law expressly provided that the President of the United States, who, under our Constitution, is charged with the responsibility of administering our foreign affairs, should alike be given the power, and he was given the power, to find

"that there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more foreign states." His was the responsibility, his is the responsibility under that statute today.

There was no attempt then to divide the responsibility between the President and the Congress so that either might refuse to act, as is possible under House Joint Resolution 306, pending before us.

In like manner the President was granted similar power with respect to the existence of a state of civil strife in a foreign state; and if such civil strife be found by him to be of such magnitude or that it "is being conducted under such conditions" that the export of munitions would threaten or endanger the peace of the United States, upon proclamation by the President accordingly, the exportation of munitions is barred. There is no such provision in the resolution pending before us. There is no provision whatever with reference to a state of war or civil strife existing in a nation under such circumstances that conditions might lead to our involvement. They have taken that out of the pending measure. They have relaxed that part which we found so essential with reference to the Spanish situation that a resolution was adopted by the Senate January 8, 1937, to forbid the exportation of planes. At that time the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations told us that our very peace was being jeopardized by the state of civil strife over there, and, of course, we had to have an embargo, and, of course, it was voted. But now it is out of the measure. Why?

The law upon our books provided for the forfeiture of munitions seized for violation of the law and referred the proceedings back to those sections set forth in the act of June 15, 1917, which have ever prevailed, and under which the rights of all parties could and would be protected.

Above all, the pending law authorizes the President in so many words "from time to time by proclamation" to "definitely enumerate the arms, ammunition, and implements of war the export of which is prohibited." In any future proclamation he may include articles or materials of the same general character as were listed in his proclamation of April 10, 1936, and, pursuant to the statute, on May 4, 1937, the President issued Proclamation No. 2237.

Mr. President, whatever was in that proclamation he put there. Whatever was omitted from that proclamation he omitted. If there were goods of like character not named in that proclamation within the category defined by him, their omission was due to the fact that he left them out, for the proclamation was solely his.

What did he do in that proclamation? He created seven categories which were classified as arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

The first category was subdivided into six sections. The first included rifles and carbines and barrels for those weapons; the second, machine guns, automatic rifles, and pistols, and barrels for those weapons; the third, guns, howitzers, and mortars, their mountings and barrels; the fourth, ammunition in excess of .22 caliber for the arms, cartridge cases or bullets, and also included filled and unfilled projectiles. The fifth included grenades, bombs, torpedoes, mines, and depth charges, filled or unfilled, and apparatus for their use and discharge; the sixth subdivision included tanks, military armored vehicles, and armored trains.

In category II the President included vessels of war of all kinds, including aircraft carriers and submarines, and armor plate for such vessels.

In category III he listed aircraft, unassembled, assembled, or dismantled, both heavier and lighter than air, if designed, adapted, and intended for aerial combat by the use of machine guns or of artillery, or for the carrying and dropping of bombs, or which are equipped with, or which by reason of design or construction are prepared for, any of the appliances known as aerial gun mounts and frames, bomb racks, torpedo carriers, and bomb or torpedo-release mechanisms.

In category IV he included revolvers and automatic pistols and ammunition therefor, for sizes in excess of .22 caliber.

In category V he listed aircraft, unassembled, assembled, or dismantled, both heavier and lighter than air, other than those included in category III. He also included propellers or air screws, fuselages, hulls, wings, tail units, and under-carriage units, as well as aircraft engines, unassembled, assembled, or dismantled.

In category VI he listed Livens projectors and flame throwers, mustard gas, and all sorts of poison gases susceptible for use in wartime.

In category VII he listed propellant powders and all sorts of high explosives.

All this would be done away with under the pending measure. All of the protection which the American people now have under our present law would be repealed. Is it the understanding of the Senate that the cause of democracy will be furthered by the exportation from the United States to certain overseas nations of Livens projectors and flame throwers? Is it the thought of some of the Senators that we should export flame throwers? Do the American people feel that we will help Great Britain and France if we send those countries mustard gas with which to poison and torture the youth of some other nation? Is it not thoughtful on our part to undertake to intervene in a war overseas to save civilization that those who come within its range may know the ravages of phosgene gas? Of course they want bombs over there. Of course they want torpedoes and submarines.

Of course, they want aircraft, to quote the language of the President's proclamation, "for the carrying and dropping of bombs." All those nations will have to do is pay us their money and we will ever take pride in the fact that we saved democracies by shipping flame throwers and poison gas. "Oh, yes; you nations with the navies and with ships to carry away our munitions, come over here, put your money on the line, and we will let you have bombs; we will let you have mustard gas; we will let you have tanks and submarines. We will help you by repealing the embargo on arms to poison those soldiers who march under the aegis of a philosophy that we do not like; and if poisoning is not enough, we will help you throw flames on them. We will act for you for cash in the name of humanity. And in case there may have been developed in our land some new forms of lethal instrumentality that the President did not think of when he issued his earlier proclamation, there need be no worry now, for we are being asked to repeal the embargo on arms, and you can get those, too."

The way our law now reads, it is unlawful for any person to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of a belligerent state or of a state where civil strife exists. It is unlawful to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, or to solicit or receive contributions for any such government. The way our law now reads, whatever exceptions are possible for ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations cannot legally, and do not, operate in favor of munitions in any particular whatever, for they simply cannot be exported. The so-called credit provision of the law upon our books applies only to supplies not named in the President's proclamations.

The way the law now reads there is no prohibition upon the solicitation or collection of funds to be used for medical aid and assistance or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering. That is our law today; and as a safeguard, collections shall be subject to the approval of the President and be made only under such rules as he shall prescribe.

The renewal or adjustment of indebtedness cannot be made to apply in favor of arms and munitions as our law now reads; and the present law applied solely and entirely to such indebtedness as existed on September 3, 1939.

The Congress thought it had created a National Munitions Control Board; and so it had. The Congress thought there could be no exportation of arms except under license granted by the Board; and so it was. The Congress thought that all licenses to export munitions should cease when the embargo proclamation should be issued, and the Congress wrote that provision into the law, and it is our law today.

Then in 1935, after long study in an effort to ascertain the type of incident which experience and history had taught were among the causes of war, the Congress provided, and it is our law today, that no American vessel may lawfully carry arms, ammunition, or implements of war to any belligerent state or to any neutral state for transshipment to a belligerent.

In 1935 the Congress wrote into the law a provision that the President shall have the power, and it shall be his duty, to require a bond so that no vessel, whether domestic or foreign, shall depart from a port of the United States carrying fuel, men, munitions, or other supplies to any warship or supply ship of a belligerent state. As a matter of fact, it has long been our law that "whenever there is reasonable cause to believe that a vessel is about to carry fuel, arms, munitions, supplies, dispatches, or information to any warship of a foreign belligerent in violation" of our laws or treaties, the President may withhold clearance from any such vessel, and it shall thereupon be unlawful for such a vessel to depart, and its departure may be forbidden.

It already is our law that if once a vessel clears from a port of the United States and delivers its cargo to a warship or supply ship of a belligerent state, the departure of that vessel again during the duration of the war may be wholly prohibited.

There is nothing new about the provision dealing with submarines and armed merchant vessels. The pending measure, word for word, without the slightest change whatever, copies our existing law. Thus:

Whenever, during any war in which the United States is neutral—

And may we be and continue to remain neutral—

the President shall find that special restrictions placed on the use of the ports and territorial waters of the United States by the submarines or armed merchant vessels of a foreign state, will serve to maintain peace between the United States and foreign states, or to protect the commercial interests of the United States and its citizens, or to promote the security of the United States, and shall make proclamation thereof, it shall thereafter be unlawful for any such submarine or armed merchant vessel to enter a port or the territorial waters of the United States or to depart therefrom, except under such conditions and subject to such limitations as the President may prescribe.

It is already our law that once the President's proclamation of a state of war shall have issued it shall thereafter be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to travel on any vessel of the belligerents named by the President, except under certain specific conditions. That is our law and has been since 1935. Why should we repeal our present law? Why should we reverse a policy of peace and nonintervention?

All of these things we have; all of these provisions are now our law. But in the pending measure we would repeal the embargo on arms contained in the joint resolution of August 31, 1935, as amended, and the joint resolution of January 8, 1937. We have heard all sorts of reasons given why the prohibition contained in the laws of 1935 and 1937 should be repealed.

Mr. President, let me point out a subject which the Committee on Foreign Relations and its members have studiously failed to explain to the Senate.

I perceive that the only member of the Foreign Relations Committee present in the Chamber at the moment is the junior Senator from Texas. I call the specific attention of the Senator from Texas to what I am about to say. I had hoped that the Committee on Foreign Relations would construe this provision of our statutes with me. I call attention specifically to the fact that the committee has wholly failed to explain the provision to which I am about to refer, and that there has never been reference by the committee, on this floor or otherwise, to that provision.

The committee wants the joint resolution passed. It wants to repeal the present arms embargo, which would apply to the current war in Europe, but it does not tell us even one word about an arms embargo not referred to in any way in the pending measure.

Mr. President, on January 31, 1922, the Congress of the United States passed the statute appearing in Forty-second Statutes at Large at page 361. The embargo provisions, particularly, will be found in title 22, section 236. Let me recall this section to the minds of the Senators by quoting:

Whenever the President finds that in any American country, or in any country in which the United States exercises extraterritorial jurisdiction, conditions of domestic violence exist, which are or may be promoted by the use of arms or munitions of war procured from the United States, and makes proclamation thereof, it shall be unlawful to export, except under such limitations and exceptions as the President prescribes, any arms or munitions of war from any place in the United States to such country until otherwise ordered by the President or by Congress.

Mr. President, that statute is on our books today.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not desire that the Senator yield, but as the Senator from Texas was called out of the Chamber he thought he heard the Senator from Connecticut express a desire to obtain some information from the Senator from Texas. What is it the Senator from Connecticut wants to know?

Mr. DANAHER. I wanted to have it appear specifically that at the moment there was no member of the Committee on Foreign Relations present. I wanted to make the Record show that in due course I would come back to this subject when there were such members present. At that moment the Senator from Texas came in, and I was glad to see him; and, so far as I personally am concerned, an explanation from him would probably take the place of that of any of the other members of the committee. Therefore I directed my question to the attention of the Senator from Texas to point out to him specifically what this statute is.

Mr. CONNALLY. May I say to the Senator from Connecticut that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been in the Chamber all the time, and the Senator from Texas was in the Chamber but was called out momentarily, when, hearing the voice of the Senator from Connecticut, he arrested his motion and remained in the Chamber. What is it the Senator from Connecticut wants to know?

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Texas for his mellifluous reference, and I am certain that the Senator from Utah, had I perceived him, would have been able adequately and properly to answer the question just as could the Senator from Texas. Now that they are both here, I will address them both.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will do that and tell us what it is that he wants to know, I will try to answer him.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, on our books today is the statute which I have read. For 17 years it has been a part of our fixed policy. I want to know if it is the thought of the sponsors of the pending joint resolution that we shall invoke an arms embargo anywhere in the American Hemisphere, north or south, whenever it suits our purposes to take part in domestic strife, and impose such an embargo on arms, north or south, as the case may be, but when there is a European war, which might involve our very livelihood and our very continued existence, we are asked to repeal that principle. That is the question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that I have not examined the statute to which he refers. It is not in the pending joint resolution and has nothing on earth to do with the proposed legislation; but if he will lend me his text for a moment I will be glad to examine it. I understand it is a statute relating to the Western Hemisphere. Its purpose, of course, was to preserve peace and stability here on the Western Hemisphere by not stimulating and encouraging revolutions which might be financed, probably, in the United States or along the border by the purchase of arms and the importation of those arms into those countries. I have not read the text, but I gather from what the Senator was reading that that is the kind of a statute he is talking about. Is that correct?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. President, I should like to direct another question, then, to the Senator, and I will be glad to lend him my copy of the text. I ask, then, does the Senator feel that we can secure the peace and security of the United States in a given instance by enforcing an embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to such an American state?

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that the purpose of that act—I thought everybody in the United States knew it [laughter]—is to prevent gun running, to prevent filibustering, except by the minority that is now filibustering in the United States Senate [laughter]—to prevent filibustering expeditions from the United States into Latin-American countries and the fomentation of revolutions and disturbances. For instance, in the past some of the revolutions in Mexico, measurably, have been inspired and financed and munitioned on American soil. So the act referred to was passed, not in the interest of war but in the interest of peace and stability and friendship and neighborliness in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. DANAHER. By imposing an embargo?

Mr. CONNALLY. If necessary; yes.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. By invoking an embargo on the lawless elements that are seeking to stir up war by organizing on our territory filibustering and revolutionary groups who aid and abet revolutionists and procure in the United States arms and ammunition with which to make war on a friendly country. If that is not in the interest of peace, the Senator from Texas does not know what peace is.

I wish to say further to the Senator from Connecticut that he cannot draw any parallel between that kind of action and the present Embargo Act, which, when it passed, was intended to preserve peace and neutrality, but which, under the operation of circumstances as they have afterward developed, has not made the United States neutral as between the warring nations but has made the United States an ally of Hitler and Stalin. That is the kind of thing the Senate is now trying to get rid of, and which the Senator from Connecticut is opposing.

Mr. DANAHER. Oh, then the Senator takes the position that the real purpose of our being here is to get rid of Hitler? Is that it?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no. The Senator, in all fairness, ought to yield to me to make a correction.

Mr. DANAHER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is not the purpose at all. The purpose is to be absolutely fair and impartial between the parties. We are not making war on Hitler, but we do not propose to be his ally and give him aid and comfort which are denied under the embargo act to England and France. That is the answer to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I have since the commencement of this colloquy sent to the Senator from Texas the text of the act to which I referred.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sending it back to the Senator. The Senator from Texas does not have to carry the texts around in his pocket and refer to them momentarily in order to know, in a general way, what a particular act is. I gladly restore to the Senator the main and most important section of his speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. DANAHER. May I call the attention of the Senator from Texas to that particular embargo provision applies alike to the extraterritorial jurisdiction of the United States. Take, for instance, China. Although hundreds of thousands of Chinese have been slaughtered, we have never invoked the embargo provision against Japan. Quite to the contrary, we have undertaken to continue to supply munitions to Japan at the same time we are making loans to China to help them both carry on that war. What kind of policy is that, I ask the Senator from Texas?

Mr. President, if all the arguments for the repeal of the arms embargo are on the high plane we have been hearing about, why do we wish to retain the power to issue an embargo against some American country? Why do we wish to

retain the power to embargo the exportation of arms and munitions to some American country or a country in which the United States exercises extraterritorial jurisdiction where conditions of domestic violence exist? Why do we think it should be unlawful to export arms under such circumstances, but wish to repeal a law which will make it unlawful to export the same kind of arms and the same munitions in the case of a European conflict?

The only answer is—and it is perfectly apparent from the answer submitted plainly and clearly by the Senator from Texas—that we want to do it in the American continent in the interest of peace and security and in the interest of the protection of the United States and the Western Hemisphere, but with reference to Europe we want to do it, according to him, so that we may get rid of Hitler.

Are we to retain the right to say which of our "good neighbors" will feel the heavy hand of our power and which will not? As might be expected, just as we have found the present law a protection in the Italian-Ethiopian War and otherwise, so, too, have we acted under the embargo clause applying to American countries. On January 7, 1924, we found that there prevailed in Mexico such conditions of domestic violence that the exportation of arms and munitions might promote that condition, so a President issued a proclamation under section 236. Again a President of the United States found such conditions of domestic violence in Brazil that he issued a proclamation on October 22, 1930, and the embargo on the exportation of arms and munitions was made effective.

We have all heard the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee tell this Senate that the embargo created by our present law "is operating unneutrally" in Europe, and so he wants our present law repealed. But, Mr. President, you have not heard one word about repealing the embargo provisions of our statutes which would operate with reference to an American country, or a country in which the United States exercises extraterritorial jurisdiction. Oh, no; we must retain that provision, we must retain the power to embargo the exportation of arms, we must tell the Senate and the American people, according to the sponsors of the pending joint resolution, that the law now upon our statute books is contrary to American policy.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I do not desire to interrupt the Senator, but I have been waiting to ask him a question for my own information. He said in his opening remarks that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee stated that the pending joint resolution must pass in its present form without amendment. I merely wondered what was the authority for that statement.

Mr. DANAHER. I believe that I used not the word "must" but the word "should." I would want it so to appear in any case. Now with reference to the authority for the statement, let me say to the Senator that when the Senator from Nevada was explaining the joint resolution to the Senate on the opening day that is what he told us.

Mr. HATCH. That is the reason I asked the Senator, because, when he made that statement, my curiosity was aroused, and I scanned hurriedly through the speech of the Senator from Nevada on the opening day, but I saw not a line or syllable which indicated any such thing, and I was wondering if I had overlooked something.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that I do not think so. If I said "must"—and I do not think I did, but if I did—I should not want it so to appear. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

No, Mr. President; we got this thing just about right when we examined the report submitted by the Committee on Foreign Relations to accompany the joint resolution. You know, Mr. President, when we got that report, down at the end of it was the clue, there was the key, there was the touchstone by which we were to test the purpose of the joint reso-

lution, just as one gradually hears it coming out as we did a few minutes ago from the Senator from Texas.

The committee was of the opinion—

I am quoting from the committee report—

that the provisions in existing law providing for an embargo upon arms, ammunition, and implements of war should be repealed and not reenacted in any form. Therefore such provisions are not carried in the present proposed substitute.

The committee is of the opinion that the United States cannot maintain its neutrality so long as such embargo provisions remain upon our statute books. It is contrary to the accepted precepts of international law, which prescribe that any belligerent may purchase any article or materials in any neutral country.

On the floor of the Senate the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee stated that he favors repeal "because the act is not operating neutrally in Europe today." It has become increasingly apparent to the Senate that repeal of the arms embargo is sought for the purpose of aiding certain belligerents in the war now prevailing between Great Britain and France on the one hand and Germany on the other. The purpose of the pending legislation is to enable the United States to sell arms, ammunition, and implements of war to Great Britain and France. The joint resolution contemplates that those belligerents which can establish credits or which can pay cash will be able to buy, while those which have neither credits nor cash cannot buy such arms, ammunition, and implements of war in this country. The joint resolution contemplates that arms will be carried away from this country in ships owned by the purchaser which have a reasonable prospect of reaching their foreign destination under the protection of the navy of the purchasing nation. It is a matter of common knowledge that Great Britain owns such ships and possesses such a navy, and that Germany does not. It necessarily follows that the real purpose of this joint resolution is not to attain neutrality for the United States, not to prevent us from intervening in the current European war, but to furnish arms, ammunition, and implements of war to Great Britain and France.

Necessarily, then, this joint resolution will constitute legislation by the United States of America not for our country but to make it possible that one group of the "belligerents may purchase" such arms as it may require in this country, and hence we are undertaking to legislate for the belligerents upon one side in this war.

A "neutral" is defined as one "not engaged on either side; not taking part with or assisting either of two or more contending parties; lending no active assistance to either or any belligerent." "Neutrality" is defined as the "quality or state of being neutral," and in international law it is defined as "the condition of a state or government which refrains from taking part directly or indirectly in a war between other powers."

It is idle to contend that the United States will be "neutral" if it undertakes to render assistance to one side in that war. It is specious and misrepresentative to call this resolution the "Neutrality Act of 1939" when the real purpose of its sponsors is to permit the United States to render active assistance to Great Britain and France. If that is not the purpose of this legislation, what is its purpose? What possible reason can there be for repealing the existing law, which prohibits the exportation of arms to any belligerent, if it not be to furnish arms to Great Britain and France? As the law reads now and has read since 1937, upon the outbreak of a war it is unlawful to furnish arms to any belligerent. The exportation of such arms is illegal and absolutely forbidden. So the sponsors of this joint resolution wish to be freed from the restraint and the prohibitions of that law, and hence they ask the Senate to repeal the existing law.

They do not come in here and submit to us a joint resolution which would frankly and honestly raise the question of whether or not this country will help Great Britain and France, and if so, upon what basis, and thus give us the opportunity to discuss, as a matter of policy, the proposition of how far, or for what reasons, we should take sides in the European war. They do not raise the question of whether or not the maintenance of Great Britain's imperialism, or the continuance of Great Britain's commercial structure, or even the succession of her form of government, should be made our

concern. What do we know of the aims and the policies of the 13 political parties in France? And if we did know, upon what possible consideration should the United States of America undertake to say that our people will furnish arms and credits to that nation for the maintenance of such policies?

Let us look first and briefly to our position from the standpoint of what repeal of the arms embargo would mean as a matter of international law. As a neutral, the United States was not bound to forbid exportation of arms and munitions to a belligerent. Many directly neutral states have, however, found it expedient and judicious to prevent their nationals from engaging in supplying destructive weapons to a belligerent. Our Nation took the position, and it is now our present law, operating with complete success in the European war, that we had a right to forbid such exportations upon the outbreak of a war. It may be worthy of note in passing that section 245a of title 22 prescribed that—

Whenever the President shall find that there exists a state of war between, or among, two or more foreign states, the President shall proclaim such fact, and it shall thereafter be unlawful to export * * * arms * * * from any place in the United States to any belligerent state named in such proclamation.

Pursuant to the plain mandate of the statute just cited, our President issued his proclamation. The joint resolution now pending before this body varies the existing law in marked degree. Because it removes from the President his obligation to issue any such proclamation, it divides the responsibility for acting between the President and the Congress, so that neither one is bound to act for the protection of the American people. Above all, there is added a very particular limitation, for the joint resolution provides that in addition to the finding that a state of war exists it must also be found—and I quote—

That it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States.

So that the question of who shall act, and upon what state of facts, is made nebulous and uncertain, and would be markedly confused. This great weakness in the pending joint resolution must be profoundly explored.

But at least, as the law now stands upon our books, the step demanded by the American people, written into the law by our Congress and approved by our President, has been duly and legally and properly taken. Unless the actual necessities of our status as a neutral shall demand we may not legally, without becoming unneutral, change our position after the war has broken out because of a desire to aid one or the other belligerent. If we should be actuated by motives simply to assist one side in this contest, we would stand as frankly and nakedly before the world as a breaker of treaties as any aggressor or any dictator who has received the condemnation of our people through their spokesman during the past 20 months.

It may be said that we have no treaty and no agreement that we will not furnish arms to a belligerent in a war; but our legislators and our Executive, acting pursuant to their sworn duties, passed and approved our present law, and served notice upon the nations of the world that when a war broke out not involving us we would not take sides. The American people advised all other peoples that we would not be purveyors to their destruction.

Dr. Edwin Borchard, of world-wide reputation, and professor of international law at Yale University, recently addressed the Council on Foreign Relations in Chicago, where he said:

The proposal to lift the arms embargo cannot be described as designed to insure the protection of American neutrality, for the obvious purpose is to help the Allies to obtain arms, ammunition, and the implements of war. If that is the motive—and the motive in these matters is all-important—then the lifting of the embargo is an act of war and intervention, and it should be debated as such. The assumption that a neutral can change his law so as to help one side beat the other and yet escape the consequences of war is hazardous.

The motive is all-important, says Dr. Borchard. Yes; reason and common sense tell us that the motive back of the

pending joint resolution is the touchstone by which we can test the conduct of the American Nation if we are to align our people upon one side in the war.

The sponsors of the joint resolution have contended that since all belligerents after repeal would in theory have whatever rights they had in 1914, let us say, the pending resolution will not be unneutral. But we are not blind to the plain fact of the matter, and neither our people nor the Congress can be ignorant of what the result would be. Recently Dr. Charles Cheney Hyde and Dr. Philip C. Jessup, professors of international law at Columbia University, said in the New York Times:

Relaxation of embargoes after the outbreak of war may in fact and in law amount to governmental participation in the conflict. This is obvious if or when the reason for removing a particular embargo is to aid the cause of one or more of the fighting states which will vastly profit from such action because of their command of the seas. In such a situation the neutral purveyor becomes the special support or prop of the favored belligerent, and the government as well as the people of the neutral becomes in reality a participant in the conflict. Such conduct is, under such circumstances, unneutral. * * *

I am not unaware that other authorities have been cited with conflicting viewpoints, but before the present law was passed in 1935 and amended in 1937, the best-informed authorities at our State Department favorably testified at hearings publicly held upon the pending legislation. Whatever doubts might be urged as a result of the conflicting viewpoints of academicians, our State Department, our Congress, and our President long ago resolved those doubts in favor of the existing law. I am confidently persuaded that the views then expressed and crystallized into legislation were then and now are correct, and that the legislation should stand.

Let us next consider briefly the proposition pending before us from the standpoint of policy, of whether we wish morally to make and export munitions to be used for the destruction of people with whom we have no quarrel and who make no attack upon us. Let us also consider the proposition from the standpoint of the possibility of our being drawn into the war, of the need for our selling munitions to certain belligerents, from the standpoint, if you like, of the actual facts of the situation and from the standpoint of what becomes of our neutrality and of our Nation.

Mr. President, we are a nation whose domestic economy for many years has been unstable and threatened. We have domestic policies as well as foreign, even theories of government, upon which our own millions of people fail to agree. It is no doubt true that we do not approve of the tactics, the practices, and even the religion of head hunters in some distant land. It is probably true that we do not approve of the aims, the economy, and the philosophy of Germany; but even if we do not, is it possible to shoot an idea with a bullet? Can it be demonstrated that our ways of thought and our inclinations and ambitions are to be subverted by blasting of people with bombs, made by us, dropped from airplanes constructed and exported by Americans?

Now, Mr. President, let me say to Senators that if we could do so, we should not.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order made by the Senator from Massachusetts that the Senate is not in order is well taken. The Chair requests that the occupants of the galleries be in order and that the Senate be in order.

Mr. DANAHY. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. Through the law as it now stands, we have for several years served notice upon the peoples of the world that in the event of war between or among nations we would not supply lethal destructive weapons to belligerents. As the law now stands, we are firmly and completely aloof from the war. We sell no arms to either side, and we certainly cannot be drawn into war therefore because of the sale of such munitions. But if we relax our law, if we repeal its present prohibition, and if we undertake to furnish such arms to one side, there exists the ever-present possibility that because we have thus taken sides we may be drawn into the war. Why would we take such a

step? Would we take this step for money? Would we take that risk for credits? Would we do it for gain?

I made inquiry through the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to discover the facts with reference to exports of munitions and total exports from the United States to Europe during the fiscal years 1914-16, and discovered that several other Senators, some of them supporters of the pending measure, were receiving at the same time identically the same information.

Mr. President, I know, and these other inquiring Senators know, that the ratio of ammunition and firearms to total exports to Europe in 1914 was less than 1 percent, in 1915 was 2 percent, in 1916 was 14 percent, and in 1917, in April of which year we entered the war, it was 18 percent—a constantly increasing ratio year by year. I have seen various estimates of the total amounts of cash and credits now available in this country to Great Britain and France. They aggregate approximately \$10,000,000,000. One percent of \$10,000,000,000 is one hundred million, 2 percent is two hundred million. Is there anyone anywhere in this country, regardless of the motives by which he is actuated, who would risk sending our boys to France to be killed in this senseless war for a munitions trade of one hundred million or two hundred million dollars? Of course, to state the question is to state its answer.

No, Mr. President, if we are going to send our boys out to die, we will not do it for money. So let us look a little further into this proposition to ascertain why some would risk the possibility of our entrance into this war. Would we undertake the possibility of entering this war, and, therefore, repeal the present arms embargo, on the ground that Great Britain needs arms to be supplied by us? In that connection it should be mentioned that the present law created a National Munitions Control Board, consisting of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Commerce. Under the law, every person who engages in the business of manufacturing and exporting arms, ammunition and implements of war must register with the Board and receive a registration certificate and license, and the exportation of arms by any other than a licensed person is made unlawful. The Board is required to make an annual report to Congress, and it is indeed a matter of great interest to examine the figures reported by the Board.

For example, from December 1, 1936, to November 30, 1937, export licenses of arms and the like to Great Britain were \$1,833,971. From December 1, 1937, to November 30, 1938, export licenses in favor of Great Britain were issued to the total of \$26,611,797.

Mr. President, there has been some claim on the floor of the Senate that we were undertaking to arm aggressor nations at the very time when peaceful nations were not arming. Yet from December 1, 1937, to November 30, 1938, down to 2 months after Munich, export licenses were issued to Great Britain in the total of \$26,611,797. Over the same period licenses were issued to Germany in the amount of \$189,664. For the first 4 months of 1939 the licenses total only \$14,008,980.

Surely Great Britain had at least as much information about the impending war as did the people in this country. Surely it is reasonable to conclude that if Great Britain were in need of arms, ammunition, and implements of war we could expect to find her export licenses increasing month by month. Surely she could have bought safely and legally any and all arms, ammunition, and implements of war up to the date of the issuance of the President's proclamation on September 3, 1939. Until a state of war was declared by the President to exist, there was no limitation whatever upon purchase by Great Britain from us of all the munitions she chose to export. But in May 1939 export licenses were issued for such munitions to be exported to Great Britain in the amount of only \$227,152. In the month of June export licenses were issued for exports to Great Britain in the total of \$79,633. In the month of July, \$71,801 and for the month of August only \$321,434.

Mr. President, between the end of April 1939 and August 31, 1939, export licenses were issued to export arms and munitions and implements of war to Great Britain in the total amount of less than \$701,000.

That was 2 weeks after our President took to the radio and broadcast a message to an overseas ruler—within 2 weeks. Commencing at the end of April 1939, and running down to and including August 31, 1939, just before the outbreak of the war, export licenses were issued to Great Britain in a total amount of less than \$701,000. These are figures furnished to me by the Secretary of State.

This situation will admit of only three inferences, and one of those three inferences necessarily is that Great Britain did not want and does not need munitions from this country. The second of those inferences is bound up in the fact that someone ordered the German steamship *Bremen* detained in New York Harbor for a period of 2 days before there had been a declaration of war. The other of those inferences is bound up in the fact that the American fleet is today, and for several months has been, in the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. President, Great Britain has had no interests in Poland, but she has billions in the Orient, from New Zealand and Australia north and west to India, and up through the Straits Settlements into China.

It is common knowledge that a severe and raging war has engaged Japan for many, many months, and that during the progress of that war the United States has continued to furnish arms, munitions, and implements of war to Japan. There is not a town in the United States, there is not a village or hamlet from which the scrap iron has not been collected to be manufactured into munitions, to be made into slugs, for use by the Japanese Army. At the same time that the United States has been assisting Japan to conduct a war whose necessary result is to deplete Japanese manpower and Japan's economic resources the United States has been making loans to China. This has been done by the Export-Import Bank through the Universal Trading Corporation, as well as directly through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation itself, with the result that we have assisted Japan in making a war and China in continuing it. For whose benefit is all this done? As a part of what policy? How is it that we can invoke an embargo in the Italo-Ethiopian War, but there is talk of repealing it when Great Britain is at war?

How is it that we can further the policy of Great Britain with reference to the Spanish War and invoke an embargo against both sides there, but we are asked to repeal it in the present war? If the United States really wishes to help Great Britain, in what way can we best assist her?

Mr. President, perhaps Great Britain does not want this arms embargo repealed. Is it not about time that we asked Great Britain in what way the United States can best be of help, for it may well be that the last thing Great Britain wants is repeal of the arms embargo. On January 4, 1939, Senator PITTMAN introduced into the RECORD the speech of Rt. Hon. Anthony Eden, delivered in New York City in December, from which I quote:

Nor are we calling out for help to others nor seeking to lure others to pull our chestnuts from the fire. We have no such intention.

That same day the President of the United States told us that—

There comes a time in the affairs of men when they must prepare to defend not their homes alone but the tenets of faith and humanity on which their churches, their governments, and their very civilization are founded. The defense of religion, of democracy, and of good faith among nations is all the same fight. To save one we must now make up our minds to save all.

What inference do you draw then from the facts and the figures? It may be well that Great Britain does not need or want the kind of help that sponsors of this resolution would seek to give her.

Suppose we should make the hideous mistake of repealing the embargo upon the exportation of arms and adopt the resolution as it stands, the Japanese need only declare a war upon China and thereupon take possession of all commerce

on the Pacific Ocean. Under the provisions of this joint resolution Japan, with resources at her command, can buy all the arms and implements of war for which she has the ability to pay or for which credits will be extended to her. She has the merchant ships to carry her purchases across the ocean. She has the navy to protect her merchant ships. Then China, without resources and without a navy, will be absolutely at the mercy of her enemy. We would be undertaking, according to the proponents of the resolution, to assist one side whom we deem worthy in the European war, while at the same time we would definitely assist in the creation of a new war in the Orient. Those who would like to see Germany defeated in the Occident would promote a certain ascendancy of Japan in the Orient. Will it be argued that such a result is desired by those who wish to assist Great Britain and France?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKellar in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Connecticut has been discussing the Japanese-Chinese situation as it exists at the present time. Is there anyone in the country who does not agree that China and Japan have been in war for the last couple of years?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I understand, without knowing, and without wishing it definitely ascribed to me, that the President of the United States does not know it, and has never issued a proclamation embargoing arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

Mr. LUCAS. In reply to the suggestion made by the Senator from Connecticut, technically under the Embargo Act which the Senator is defending so vigorously in this debate, there has never been any declaration of war between China and Japan, and because of that, as I understand it, there has been no embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war. One of the very reasons why the Senator from Illinois is for the repeal of the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war is because of the fact that for the last few years China and Japan have been able to buy everything that the munitions makers in this country could sell them, and the law we have on the statute books at the present time has in nowise kept China and Japan, if they could negotiate with the munitions makers in this country, from purchasing the war supplies, the death weapons, that the Senator is talking about.

Furthermore, the point made by the colleague of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] today, a point which the Senator from Illinois made in a radio address the other night, and something which I hope someone who is interested in the continuation of this embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war will explain to me, is this: Under the present law we can sell to communistic Russia today all the bombing planes and the implements of death she can afford to buy, and the records will show that during the last 4 or 5 years Russia has bought millions of dollars worth of munitions of war from the United States of America, or from the people interested in the making of death weapons in this country. And, yet, under the present embargo act, as it is on the statute books at this moment, we cannot sell a pound of powder to Canada, which has been our peaceful neighbor for over 100 years.

If I may move into the realm of speculation for a moment, if the Senator will pardon me, I wish to do a little speculating, because as I have listened to the debate in the United States Senate during the last 2 weeks there has been a good deal of speculation and not enough facts, in my humble opinion. And so I presume I will be in order in so doing. Let me premise this bit of conjecture by saying at the outset I hold no brief for imperialistic England, or imperialistic France, or the ideologies of Stalin or Hitler.

The Senator from Illinois is primarily interested in his own America first, last, and all the time, to the end that we shall keep the peace and stay out of this war. But as I try to analyze this law which is on the statute books at the

present time, I cannot understand how anyone can justly say that it is a law of strict neutrality as it is applied to all nations at the present time. For instance, if we do not know it, the people of Poland do, that Russia is at war. We sell her anything and everything, and does anyone doubt that some of those supplies will ultimately reach Germany? We sell Belgium all the war supplies she wants. Does anyone believe that she would not in turn send a part of them to England or France if they needed them?

Since speculation and guesswork seem to be working overtime in these debates, let me make one further chance observation. I say that it is not beyond the realms of possibility that before this war is finished Germany will declare war on Finland, and then Mr. Stalin and his bears will move in on that peaceful nation, just as they moved in on Poland, and we will still be selling Russia, and yet under this law we will be unable to sell a single war supply to Finland, the only nation in Europe that has paid her debts.

Those are the things which I say to the Senator from Connecticut have bothered me in connection with attempting to arrive at an honest and intelligent conclusion as to whether I should vote to lift this embargo or to continue the embargo.

I wish to say further, in conclusion, that in my humble judgment the Senators of the United States in this debate have far overemphasized and magnified the importance of the continuation or the repeal of the arms embargo, as far as getting us in or keeping us out of war is concerned. In my humble judgment the cash-and-carry plan so far overshadows either the continuation or the repeal from the standpoint of keeping us out of the holocaust of hell across the way that there is no comparison between the two.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me of his time.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, at the very outset let me thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for his contribution to this debate. In the judgment of the junior Senator from Connecticut his views are always interesting, they are certainly sincere, and above all he is mentally honest. With that approach I want to undertake, Mr. President, to take up the points mentioned by the Senator from Illinois.

In the first place, he says that, as he understands, the present law did not work with reference to Japan and China simply because a war had not been declared. That is the expression he used. In the first place, Mr. President, the law does not require that war be declared before a state of war shall exist, and that is why the statute adopted the language "a state of war."

That is why those very words are interpolated into that statute, because it has not been the policy in recent years for countries to declare war. They move in on another country. Everybody in the United States, as the Senator says, knows that there was a state of war in China, but officially we did not act. There was nothing the matter with our statute. The statute was there. But, Mr. President, if that is all that is bothering the Senator from Illinois, then I will say to him that I shall be happy to join with him in furthering a resolution which will call upon the President to declare and to issue the embargo on arms against Japan, which will remove that ground of objection.

In the second place, Mr. President, the Senator said that he cannot for the life of him understand how the pending measure would authorize the shipment of munitions to communistic Russia, as he described it.

I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I will join with him in stopping such shipment, because all we have to do is to amend our present law and forbid the exportation of munitions to any neutral country. We do not have to repeal the embargo, which says we may not ship to belligerent countries. So, Mr. President, we will dispose of that point of objection. I know the senior Senator from Illinois will go along with me that far.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the proposal of the Senator, assuming that he could satisfy my position, I take it he

would have the Congress amend the statute as it exists at the present time, to meet the objections which I have pointed out.

Mr. DANAHER. Exactly.

Mr. LUCAS. I take it the Senator would not claim that we would then be changing the rules in the middle of the game?

Mr. DANAHER. No; for we should not be relaxing our law.

The whole test is whether or not we are relaxing our law in favor of one side. We as a neutral Nation have the right to tighten up, but we have no right to relax the provisions of our protective statute in the event a war shall have broken out.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, whether we relax or whether we tighten the law makes little difference, in my opinion. It depends largely upon the attitude of mind of Senators as they view the situation before them. In my judgment, if the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut was enacted into law we would be doing the very thing which a number of Senators have been protesting against from the time the debate started. In other words, if I have understood the position of a number of Senators on the floor insofar as the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war is concerned, the Congress of the United States can do nothing to promote or affect our own domestic policy and take care of our own general welfare. We must remain stagnant; we must remain sterile; we must remain paralyzed until those fellows across the pond finish their bloody deeds; and after that we can change this law if Congress so desires.

Mr. HOLT and Mr. LODGE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield and, if so, to whom?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HOLT. I do not believe it is necessary to repeal the law to put the arms embargo in effect in connection with the situation between Russia and Poland. When Russia went into Poland she declared war against Poland, whether she did it by letter or by arms. It does not require any change in law to put the arms embargo in effect in that situation. Why should we indict a law because the President fails to administer it?

The situation is the same with respect to Japan and China. The law actually covers the situation; but the administration will not touch it, because the President himself has failed to do so. It is not the fault of the law.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the contribution from the Senator from West Virginia, and I can understand exactly how he feels about the President of the United States in connection with the enforcement of the Embargo Act; but I undertake to say that there are a number of Senators who, if the President of the United States issued a proclamation embargoing arms, ammunition, and implements of war to Japan, China, Russia, or any other nations which might be at war but have not so declared, and have not advised the world officially that they are at war, they would be among the first to declare that President Roosevelt was again usurping power and arbitrarily exercising authority which he does not have under the present law. This has been a charge made against him over and over again.

Mr. HOLT and Mr. LODGE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia, simply in order that he may conclude his colloquy with the Senator from Illinois. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] for his forbearance.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, the President of the United States declared an embargo in the Italian-Ethiopian War. There was no declaration of war in that instance. In the Japanese-Chinese War the Japanese are just as much aggressors as was Italy in the former case. The only difference

is that England wanted us to declare an embargo in one instance, and in the other she did not; and we listened, as usual, to the voice of Downing Street instead of the voice of Main Street of America.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to submit to the Senator from Connecticut this thought, which was brought into comment by the interesting idea propounded by the Senator from Illinois: It is not truly accurate to speak in terms of changing the rules while the game is in progress. Is it not a much more accurate phrase to say that we should not change the balance of power while the war is in progress? It is not so much changing the rules. It is changing the balance of power. If we change the balance of power while the war is in progress, then it seems to me that by any sincere or fair test we are being unneutral.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his observation. Answering that particular comment in my own way, let me say that war is no game. War is a hideous, foul destruction of human beings, life, and property.

Mr. President, under the rules of international law we find our answer—the international law, if you please, to which the President in his message said he wished to return. He told us that we ought to return to international law; that that and the repeal of the arms embargo were the crux of the problem confronting the Congress. Under the rules of international law—not the “rules of the game”—if once a nation has taken the position of a neutral and a war shall have broken out, that neutral may not change the rules of its announced position. It may not change its status motivated by any desire to help one side in the war without thereby becoming unneutral in the eyes of international lawyers and in the eyes of history. We as a nation certainly do not want to stand as naked as a treaty breaker in any such aspect.

Mr. President, I think that the contributions of the various Senators who have participated in the colloquy in the past few minutes have served, perhaps even better than my own argument, to point up the proposition I have submitted. It seems to me it is perfectly clear what inference we ought to draw from the facts and figures with reference to the purchases by Great Britain over the past few months. It seems to me perfectly apparent that it well may be that representations of a sort not known to us have been made and entered into, on the strength of which she has acted.

I wish to refer once more to the President's message in January of 1939. He told us then:

We have learned that God-fearing democracies of the world which observe the sanctity of treaties and good faith in their dealings with other nations cannot safely be indifferent to international lawlessness anywhere. They cannot forever let pass, without effective protest, acts of aggression against sister nations—acts which automatically undermine all of us.

Obviously they must proceed along practical, peaceful lines. But the mere fact that we rightly decline to intervene with arms to prevent acts of aggression does not mean that we must act as if there were no aggression at all. Words may be futile, but war is not the only means of commanding a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. There are many methods short of war, but stronger and more effective than mere words, of bringing home to aggressor governments the aggregate sentiments of our own people.

Mr. President, at a time when we in this Nation are not embroiled in war; at a time when our own law securely prevents our intervention by supplying arms to either side, will the Senate now say that we should abandon the reasonable and proper safeguards to make a condition of safety sure, and enter upon a course wherein we undertake to adopt methods “short of war”?

Mr. President, I cannot believe it.

In this connection it may be well worth while to consider for a few minutes section 7 (a) of the pending joint resolution. It will be remembered, Mr. President, that up until yesterday the majority of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, who had sponsored the pending measure, were trying to cause us and to cause the country to believe that the financial transactions section contained within it a cash-and-carry clause. I mention the matter specifically at this time because the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois said that he felt that

the issue should not turn on repeal of the arms embargo. He feels that the most important possible safeguard is the cash-and-carry clause of the joint resolution. I think I quote in essence what the Senator said.

Mr. President, I cannot find in the joint resolution reference to any payment of cash. I cannot find in the joint resolution a reference which would limit the transfer of title conditioned upon the payment of even a 5-cent piece in cash. I should like respectfully to ask the senior Senator from Illinois where he has found any such provision in the joint resolution. I think what he meant was that we ought to have some such provision in the joint resolution. Is not that what the Senator meant?

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure the Senator knows that before this debate is over there will be a cash-and-carry provision which, in my opinion, will not only satisfy the Senator from Connecticut, but will satisfy the American people. The provision as it exists at the present time is not satisfactory to the Senator from Illinois. I have never made that statement before to anyone; but I will say coldly and bluntly that the cash-and-carry provision as it is written in the pending measure is not satisfactory to me. I understand that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], in due course of time, will move to amend the measure so that it will be approved by the Senator from Connecticut; and I know that when it is satisfactory to him it will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Illinois from the bottom of my heart. I knew, mentally honest as he is, that he would so state; but actually, Mr. President, the joint resolution is still speaking in futuro. Cash and carry is not in it, and, as the Senator from Illinois says, if we are ever going to have a cash-and-carry provision put in the measure, apparently the Senator from Nevada will have to come up with another amendment to bring the joint resolution within the cash-and-carry purview, which the country was told was already in it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator from Connecticut should be a little more charitable to the Senator from Nevada, who is not now present. I think the Senator from Connecticut knows well enough that seldom a bill comes to the floor of the Senate that is not amended. Now I think the point with reference to the 90-day credit feature will probably be the only serious objection the Senator from Connecticut will have and whenever he is satisfied upon that question, in the final analysis, he will support the Senator from Illinois in the belief that a cash-and-carry provision, if it is so written as to satisfy him beyond any shadow of doubt, is more important than either the repeal or the continuation of the arms embargo. I hope the Senator will vote his convictions on the arms embargo, which will be for its continuation, but after that I hope he will seriously weigh the question of cash-and-carry and see if he cannot, in the last analysis, determine that the latter is more important and finally vote for the pending joint resolution, assuming always that the provision for the arms embargo shall be repealed.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I first want to thank the Senator from Illinois. I know he did not mean to imply that I was uncharitable to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], for whatever I happened to say at the time I have said in his presence, and if it were a case of repeating it I should be glad to do that when he is present; so there is no question on that point I am sure.

In the second place, I did submit to him specifically the other day wherein in the joint resolution could he find anything that required payment of cash so as to come within the so-called cash-and-carry idea. It is not there.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. HOLT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, while I do not wish to prolong the Senator's discussion of this matter by injecting myself into his speech, yet it ought to be said, in order that

the record may be clear, that there has never been a law enacted by Congress that required the payment of cash for arms, ammunition, and implements of war. There has never been a measure introduced by anybody, even by those who oppose the pending measure that would require the payment of cash in the ordinary sense of the word.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, when this matter was before it, put the 90-day provision in as a restriction. Some of those opposing the measure, and who opposed the repeal of the arms embargo in the committee, took the position that 90 days was not sufficient, that 120 days was really necessary in order that transactions regarded in international trade as cash might be cleared across the water. But there was so much confusion in interpretation—honest confusion, I am sure—on the part of Senators, and the outside world also, it being contended by some that by the mere mention of a 90-day period we were granting something rather than making a restriction in the law as it has heretofore existed, and as provided in bills which have been introduced, in order that that matter might not be a source of confusion and misunderstanding and misrepresentation, the Senator from Nevada offered an amendment to eliminate it altogether.

The Senator from Connecticut is right—and he would be right if he made the same statement concerning all other laws which have heretofore been enacted with respect to the so-called cash and carry—that "cash" has been a misnomer from the beginning. It was a colloquialism that was attached to it largely by the newspapers, for the word "cash" was never inserted in any bill or in any law on the subject. Theoretically checks given in payment of goods are supposed to be cash, but I think everyone realizes that if we were to require customers abroad to bring money in the form of cash, currency, as does the housewife who goes to market with a basket and pays for groceries by giving the money, it would be utterly impossible to carry on any form of international trade in that way. But neither the pending joint resolution or any other measure or the law itself that has been enacted heretofore ever used the word "cash." I repeat, it has been a colloquialism that has really given a wrong impression to laws that have been enacted and measures which have been introduced.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In order to keep the record straight, let me say that I think I attended every meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee which took place where the members of the committee were invited. I wish to say that I think the Senator from Kentucky must be confusing a full committee meeting and a meeting of members of the committee who were in favor of the repeal of the arms embargo which met to draft the joint resolution, when he said that there was some suggestion that the credit clause should be extended to 120 days, and that he was in error when he credited that suggestion to members of the committee who were opposed to the repeal of the arms embargo.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin, if the Senator from Connecticut will permit me, that I distinctly recall one of the outstanding Members of the Senate and of the committee who opposes repeal of the embargo who suggested in the full committee that the joint resolution should really provide 120 days instead of 90 days. Another member of the committee, who is also an outstanding opponent of the repeal of the embargo, suggested that even if 120 days were put in, Congress would later have to extend it, because that would not be sufficient to carry on international trade even on a supposed cash basis.

We have eliminated all that by the amendment which the Senator from Nevada has offered, and it is a moot question now; but I mention it only to show that even some of those who are opposed to repeal were not opposed to the 90-day provision or even a longer time. I do not care to reveal the names of the members of the committee without their consent, but I think we all remember that discussion.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I merely want the Record to show—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield further?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I merely want the Record to show that my recollection does not serve me as that of the Senator from Kentucky serves him in connection with the statement he has made. Of course, if the Senator does recall it, I would not dispute what he says, but I thought I had been present at every meeting to which the full committee was invited.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to stand with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] in that respect. I have no recollection of any meeting that I attended—and I attended all that I was permitted to attend but one—when that question was brought up or when anything was said about the cash-and-carry problem.

The Senator from Kentucky says that in none of the laws that have been enacted regarding cash and carry has there ever been any provision with respect to the time of payment of the amount that might be charged foreign purchasers. Heretofore we have never had a law, save one, which embraced the cash-and-carry idea; and if he will read Mr. Baruch's dissertation as to why he presented that suggestion, he will see that it referred to cash and carry; that it did not refer to credit and carry. The reason for this amendment is that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee saw that it was impossible to pass the joint resolution with the provision it originally carried. So he proposes now to strike out everything in relation to credit and leave it a cash-and-carry proposition.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield further to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not going to enter into a dispute with my friend from California about something that I recall very distinctly happened in the committee but which he does not recall. I could give the Senator, in private, the names of the Senators to whom I have reference.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does the Senator mean me?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does the Senator mean the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not mean either one.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. They are the only two to whom I referred.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize, of course, that the Senator from California and the Senator from Wisconsin are both important and outstanding members of the Foreign Relations Committee and are both outstanding opponents of repeal. There are also others.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; and there stands the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. He is not an outstanding foe of repeal, but he is an outstanding proponent of repeal, and I yield to him my meed of praise for standing just that way.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is mutual, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. But now, getting back to cash, regardless of what Mr. Baruch said in his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, the provision of the law on the statute books which expired on May 1, as the Senator from California and all other Senators will recall, did not require cash payment; it only required that title should be transferred to the purchaser.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Quite so.

Mr. BARKLEY. The word "cash" was not used.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. And the requirement to pay "on the barrel head," as we say, or to give a check at the time of the purchase was not in that law. The only requirement was that title should pass, and if an American manufacturer wanted to give his product to a foreign government there was nothing to prevent it in the law as it was passed and as it expired the first of last May, which contained the original so-called cash-and-carry provision.

I may be dealing in technicalities; but the point I was attempting to make was that with the amendment which the Senator from Nevada has offered—and which, I suppose, will be adopted—the joint resolution on that subject then will be practically in the same terms as the law which expired on the first of last May, with some modifications; and that the provision of the joint resolution on the subject of financial relations, preventing the flotation in this country of bonds or the sale of obligations of any belligerent or any foreign country or its subdivisions or any agent thereof, was not supposed to apply to the ordinary checks and drafts that are used in international transactions of commerce. It was supposed to apply to the public flotation of bonds, or even to private sales of bonds, obligations of governments, their political subdivisions, or agents representing them.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is not the Senator wandering far afield at the present time? We now have an academic question before us—that relating to cash and carry as the amended joint resolution has it. There is very little profit to be derived from discussing it. I should be delighted to discuss it with the Senator, because I have some very fixed views upon the subject; but I feel that the time of the Senator from Connecticut is being needlessly taken up.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure the Senator from Connecticut will appreciate the solicitude of the Senator from California with respect to his time; but he himself has been rather prodigal with it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. He has listened to everybody.

Mr. BARKLEY. The only point which I wished to make—it may be needless—was to emphasize the fact that the word "cash" now is, and always has been, a misnomer in connection with this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not concede that for an instant. From the time this kind of project was suggested we have heard all the time cash and carry, with the rat-a-tat-tat of the cash on the barrel head that could not be mistaken. From the highest to the lowest in the Government it has been cash and carry. Then a measure comes out which is not cash and carry at all, but which is credit and carry. Then the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, yesterday amends the joint resolution—a very wise precaution on his part—and we shall have, before we get through, cash and carry again; and cash and carry will be what we shall call Mr. Baruch's scheme, as he intended it to be called.

Mr. HOLT and Mr. CLARK of Missouri addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. President, so that we may not be confused, I wish Senators, in discussing the Foreign Relations Committee in the future, would state which Foreign Relations Committee they mean—the one of the Senate or the "nonpartisan" Foreign Relations Committee which drafted the pending joint resolution.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to take the Senator's time; but I have just returned to the Senate Chamber after a very brief absence to interview a constituent in the reception room, and have been told that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] made the statement that in the Foreign Relations Committee an opponent of repeal of the

embargo had said that 90 days was not enough time; that it ought to be 120 days.

Probably the Senator from Kentucky refers to a remark which I myself made, because I was the only one who made any remark which could possibly be so misconstrued. When the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] suggested that he was not willing to allow so long a period of credit in the provision as 90 days, and it ought to be cut to 60 days, I said that I was opposed to any period of credit whatever if it was going to be a cash-and-carry provision, and if we were going to have credit at all it did not make any difference whether it was 60 days or 90 days or 120 days; no matter what the period might be, it would be simply another method of beating the devil around the stump. I never said, and I did not hear anybody else in the Foreign Relations Committee say, that 90 days was not enough, and that we ought to have 120 days.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, interested and intrigued as I was by the comment of the Senator from Kentucky, I should like very much to ask him, if I may, a question regarding section 7 (a) as it will stand when amended. It is on page 21. Can the Senator find anything in section 7 (a) which will forbid the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Export-Import Bank from making a loan to a foreign government, or an agency thereof?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have not given thought to that section in the light of any possible loan on the part of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, but I should say that the provisions of section 7 (a) would apply to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or to any other agency of the Government, as rigidly as they would to any other creditor or manufacturer or agent of industry in this country that might be in the business of furnishing materials or supplies to any belligerent in the present war.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator, Mr. President. That is the construction with which I, too, will agree, and I am glad to hear that view from the Senator from Kentucky.

Now I will ask him one other question with reference to the same subject matter, if I may—whether or not, on the other hand, there is any prohibition of the use by our Treasury Department of our stabilization fund for the purpose of maintaining the currencies of Great Britain and France.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course the Senator knows that the law which created the stabilization fund prescribes the uses to which it may be put, and that in the main it is for the purpose of maintaining the American dollar and protecting the commerce of the United States against possible decline in the value of foreign currencies so as to put our manufacturers at a disadvantage. Whether the mere fact that Great Britain and France are at war ought to operate to stop the operation of the stabilization fund, or ought to prevent the Treasury from carrying on its normal activities with respect to the fund, is a subject about which Senators may have different opinions. In my own judgment, without further evidence and further experience, I do not believe the normal operation of the stabilization fund ought to be interfered with merely because there is a war in Europe.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me that the inquiry of the Senator from Connecticut as to the stabilization fund and its uses is an extremely pertinent one, particularly in view of the fact that Congress at all times has been refused any information as to the operation of the stabilization fund.

We all know that there is something over \$2,000,000,000 in the stabilization fund. We also know that during the last war Great Britain spent in the neighborhood of \$2,000,000,000—not quite that much, but in that neighborhood—in sustaining sterling exchange. I think it is a matter of the utmost importance for Congress to find out whether our \$2,000,000,000 in the stabilization fund is going to be used in this war to support British sterling exchange.

I may say to the Senator that I am preparing to address the Senate at some length upon that very subject; and I do

not think this session of Congress ought to adjourn until we find out what is going on with the stabilization fund, and find out whether, in effect and in fact, it is being used to sustain British and French exchange, which, as I say, cost nearly \$2,000,000,000 in the last war.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I am delighted to know from the Senator from Missouri that he contemplates an exploration and a dissertation upon this subject; and I shall make no further reference to it at this time. I shall certainly wish to be present to hear his remarks, for I agree with him that in the joint resolution now pending before Congress there is no limitation whatever to forbear against the money of the taxpayers of the United States being used to maintain the currencies of the nations referred to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Inasmuch as this matter has been brought into the discussion, I do not want to leave it without an observation.

The stabilization fund in its normal operations constitutes a day-to-day activity. It would be utterly impossible for the Treasury Department to keep Congress informed from day to day or from week to week about its operations, although the Treasury Department does make a report to Congress from which it can see what the Department has done during the period of the report. The stabilization fund was not created for the purpose of aiding England or France or any other country to maintain its currency, but to enable the American people to maintain their currency if it was necessary to protect our people against the abnormal decline of foreign currencies that might interfere with the sale of our products in the markets of the world. The stabilization fund is an American protective device, and not a device for the protection of any other country.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky; but I recall that when we had hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, and Secretary Morgenthau was there, the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND] questioned the Secretary of the Treasury at considerable length with reference to this subject, and the Secretary of the Treasury then stated:

We in the Treasury are not preparing for war.

The distinguished senior Senator from Virginia thereupon interposed:

Well, you had better be!

And the Secretary of the Treasury thereupon said, in effect—I am not quoting him, but I am paraphrasing his remarks from recollection—that he saw no reason for a difference between the operations of the stabilization fund in time of war and its operations in time of peace. The fact of the matter is that while we are protecting the American dollar, as the Senator from Kentucky says, we are protecting it in terms of the French franc, and we are protecting it in terms of the British pound.

Mr. BARKLEY. Only as they relate to international dealings between the business and commercial and industrial interests of the United States and those of the foreign country.

Mr. DANAHER. Which brings me precisely to section 7 (b) of the pending joint resolution.

Section 7 (b) says:

The provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of such proclamation.

Mr. President, whatever orders they want to put in, whether it be for grain, or cotton, or munitions of whatever kind, no matter whether they first put those orders in last June or whether they placed them in November, they constitute indebtedness when the contract has been acted upon, they constitute a state of indebtedness which is not inveighed against in the pending measure, which is not forbidden. There are no limitations on it, but expressly, and in so many words, even though the Senator from Nevada would

undertake to amend section 7 (a), he does not touch 7 (b). He has purposefully and intentionally written into this measure an exception, so that all indebtedness on whatever account will be taken out of the measure just so long as it exists on the date in the future when the President issues his proclamation. Consequently, when gentlemen talk about the stabilization fund, and talk about the maintenance of the American dollar, and talk about it being in furtherance of a domestic policy, for what possible purpose was section 7 (b) inserted if it was not intended to refer to such indebtedness as might be incurred by a foreign state, or a subdivision or agency thereof?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Under section 7 (b), to which the Senator has just been referring, is it not entirely possible that any nation might exchange with its own nationals new bonds, new securities, on any basis it might see fit to adopt, for old securities issued prior to the date of the declaration of war or the President's proclamation, and then use those old securities in refinancing its obligations in this country to enable it to purchase munitions or anything else?

Mr. DANAHER. It goes further; it permits the incurring of indebtedness on any account whatever. All that is needed is to have the indebtedness incurred between now, or some date in the past, and the date in the future when the President is called upon to issue his proclamation, and all such indebtedness is taken out of the operation of the proposed law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. Gladly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it is always possible, in the enactment of any statute, to find some theoretical hole through which somebody might jump. It was not supposed by the committee that we could, by the enactment of a law, change the terms of any obligation issued heretofore. At least, that was one of the considerations that entered into the drafting of this section. They are not obligations necessarily between governments. There is nothing in the joint resolution which authorizes any readjustment of the debts due the United States by the nations of Europe, or of any other part of the earth, because those debts have been refunded under an act of Congress, and the very act itself provides that the debts cannot hereafter be readjusted for any amount below the face value, with interest on them, except by another act of Congress. So that it could not refer to the debts due the United States by the nations of Europe, from one government to another.

It probably should not be made to apply to credits, whether they are for 90 days, or whatever their terms. As a matter of fact, all sales which have been made by American industry to the nations of Europe have been on a cash basis up to now, so that there are no such outstanding debts as the Senator might fear. But even if there were some, they might run 4 months or 6 months. We did not suppose that by the enactment of the law now we could change the terms of those sales, and we should not attempt to change the terms of those sales by an ex post facto law, one passed after a transaction had occurred.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. DANAHER. Not at the moment. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Kentucky. As long as the Senator from Kentucky has stated that there is a theoretical hole in this particular section, will the Senator grant to me, for purposes of discussion, that it is a hole, whether it is theoretical or not?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not grant that. The Senator can assume it.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator called it a theoretical hole.

Mr. BARKLEY. I said it might be.

Mr. DANAHER. Very well, it might be, then.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. Not for just a moment. I desire to point out to the Senator from Kentucky what the present law provides in section 245 (a), subsection (b). Has the Senator a copy of it before him?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is in the report of the committee.

Mr. DANAHER. At any rate, let me read to the Senator the language just as it appears:

The provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of the President's proclamation.

That is the present law.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is plain.

Mr. DANAHER. But what is the different effect under the present law as compared with the pending joint resolution? Let me point out to the Senator that the moment the President of the United States issued his proclamation on September 3, 1939, the present law became effective. Did it not become operative?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Consequently, on that day section 245 (a), subdivision (b) went into effect, and therefore froze all indebtedness then existing. That was the purpose of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not necessarily. But even if that be true, of course, the measure now under consideration repeals the law from which the Senator has read this section.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. And a new proclamation would have to be issued under the new law.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Therefore whatever had been "frozen" would thaw out, probably, before another proclamation was issued under the new law.

Mr. DANAHER. Which is precisely what the Senator calls a theoretical loophole, and precisely why I say that if the desire is to make that law operative, all that is necessary is to put into the pending measure a provision that the proclamation date of September 3, 1939, shall control. Why are not the proponents of it doing that? If they really want to limit credits, if they do not want indebtedness to be incurred between now and the future date of the proclamation, why do they not make it effective as of September 3, 1939? That is the law.

Mr. BARKLEY. Because each law and each proclamation issued under the law stands on its own merits, on its own bottom, and it is not necessary to go back into the past and say, in a new proclamation issued in the future, that the situation which existed on the third of September or on any other previous date shall apply to the new law or the new proclamation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Florida for his indulgence. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Connecticut, of course noting the first few lines of section 7 (a), observed that it is in that part of the section the prohibition is contained; that is to say, the prohibition against the extending of credit to any private individual or corporation in the United States "to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any State named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such State." Let us suppose that obligations extend from one of the foreign governments to citizens of the United States who have bought, for example, Canadian bonds, or suppose they have bought the bonds of a Canadian municipality, and suppose the Canadian Government or the municipality finds it desirable or necessary to propose to its bondholders the refunding of its outstanding bonded obligations.

Under the prohibition contained in the first part of section 7 (a) it would be unlawful for any American holder of any such security to agree to a refunding of those obligations, because the exchange or the purchase, or, probably, by implication, the receipt of any obligation of that character is forbidden by section 7. So in order to make it possible for private individuals who are the holders of such bonds to agree to a refunding, if they desire to do so, an exception

out of section 7 had to be carved, or it had to be made clear that refunding obligations were not forbidden by the provisions of section 7. So that was taken care of by the language of section 7 (b), which reads as follows:

The provisions of this section—

That is to say, the prohibitions contained in 7 (a)—shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of such proclamation.

That is not a prohibition; it is merely the allowance of an exception to the prohibition which appears in the first part.

If the Senator from Connecticut were trying to take care of that situation, how would he word the language of the joint resolution?

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Florida is asking me now as to how I would protect American bondholders, or foreign nationals, if you like, who live in this country; and, of course, it is possible to permit their being protected. There is no question about that. But the point about this whole law and this whole joint resolution is that if the intention really had been to make it applicable to a state of affairs which existed when the President's proclamation was issued on September 3, 1939, why does not the joint resolution so state?

Mr. PEPPER. I doubt if that provision of the measure has any reference at all to the proclamation in that sense. It does not confer any affirmative authority to buy bonds or securities. It merely provides that where securities have already been issued and the purchasers or the owners of the security are willing or agreeable to an adjustment of the obligations by refunding, for example, they may do so without violating the law. What is wrong with that sort of a permission to any bondholder?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, that is simple. The way the law reads at present, it was provided that the President would have the power in his discretion to make exceptions from the operation of this particular section, in the present law, understand, with reference to commercial credits, short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions and of a character customarily used in ordinary peacetime commercial transactions. That is our law, and when we take section 245 (b) with reference to 245 (a), and use the words "such indebtedness," we apply to any indebtedness inveighed against in section 245 (a). That is what the term "such indebtedness" applies to.

Mr. PEPPER. Let us make it clear, in the first place, that there is not any authority for any new purchases of bonds by Americans granted. So I suggest that if that is true, what difference does it make in the mind of the Senator from Connecticut what is in subdivision (a), which does not permit American citizens to become purchasers of new bonds of foreign governments, but permits only refunding operations? It permits only refunding operations. Why should we object to the bondholder having the privilege of agreeing to a satisfactory refunding obligation at any time?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, of course, if the Senator from Florida can gloss over the fact that the remainder of that section has to do with making loans, extending credits, and all the other phases and methods of incurring the indebtedness, of course that is all right; he can do that. Of course, sales on credit are included, but above everything we find in this language that it applies to the making of any loans, the extension of any credit, and consequently there is no limitation upon any such thing, and debts can be incurred, and orders can be placed, and that indebtedness will be such as is contemplated by section 7 (b).

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place the indebtedness which may get the advantage of section 7 (b) is indebtedness which must have existed at the time of the President's proclamation. Then, the indebtedness that may be incurred with the permission of the President, which is referred to on page 22, that is the short time indebtedness of 90 days, or not to exceed 90 days, cannot come into operation until after the President's proclamation. That is to say the Presi-

dent has no power to act under this law until his proclamation of a state of war first has been made.

Mr. DANAHER. Which he may never issue.

Mr. PEPPER. Therefore, if the proclamation to be effective must precede the allowance of the credit, as under the language of the measure it obviously must, the provision of section 7b can never refer to the short-term indebtedness that is provided for at the top of page 22, and can only apply at any time to the indebtedness that existed at the time of the President's proclamation, and that is old indebtedness that is funded or evidenced by security.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is about 30 hours too late. The Senator from Nevada yesterday introduced an amendment which strikes out all the language the Senator from Florida is talking about, commencing on line 16, page 21, and running to line 11, page 22. The Senator will find that amendment on his desk. It was submitted yesterday by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. LUCAS rose.

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, before that—

Mr. DANAHER. Just a minute. I wish to yield to the Senator from Illinois. I ask the Senator's indulgence.

Mr. LUCAS. What is worrying the Senator from Illinois is what is going to happen to the obligations and transactions which are carried on between September 3, the date that the President issued the proclamation of neutrality, and the date of the next proclamation, because, as I understand, in the event this law is passed we repeal the present Neutrality Act, which would in effect permit any obligations during that time negotiated to become in such a state that they could be freely exchanged here and there and everywhere.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has exactly stated the legal situation. He is exactly right, and consequently all of those orders, all of those contracts within that period of hiatus, are contemplated by section 7 (b). That is just exactly where I say that the whole door is open wide without any limitation on credits of any kind whatever.

I should like to yield now to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will excuse me for a moment.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield to me for one further question?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know whether the Foreign Relations Committee has seriously considered this point or not. I presume they have. But I should like at this particular time to offer for the consideration of those who are vitally interested in this question two short amendments, if I may be permitted to read them into the RECORD at this point.

Mr. DANAHER. I am sure there will be no question. Does the Senator apprehend that the Senator from Connecticut would lose the floor if he should permit that to be done?

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Connecticut does not either.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest that there is a possibility of curing the defect which the Senator speaks about, and I trust that the Foreign Relations Committee will give the question consideration, because I think it is important. Therefore I submit the following:

On page 21, line 14, after "proclamation", insert "or issued after the date of any proclamation issued under any prior neutrality law after September 4, 1939, and prior to the date of enactment of this joint resolution, in the case of any state named in any such proclamation, or any political subdivision of such state, or person acting for or on behalf of either."

And, I may say to the Senator from Connecticut, if the amendment should be deemed important a further amendment should be made. I submit, on page 22, the striking out of lines 12 to 14, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of indebtedness in existence on: (1) The date of any proclamation issued under any prior neutrality law after September 4, 1939, in the case of any State named in such proclamation, political subdivision thereof, or person acting for or on behalf of

either; or (2) the date of any proclamation issued under section 1 (a) of this joint resolution in the case of any other State named in such proclamation, and any political subdivision thereof, or person acting for or on behalf of either.

This amendment would correspond to the previous one. I merely submit both for whatever they may be worth, doing this solely in the hope that I have made a constructive contribution to the pending bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Do I understand correctly that the chief ground of the objection of the Senator is that the provisions of this law will probably postpone, as it were, the prohibition of existing law, or relax those prohibitions, and he is trying to freeze the period as of September 3, the date of the previous proclamation?

Mr. DANAHER. No. I am certain, Mr. President, that the Senator from Florida has misapprehended in two particulars. One, it certainly is not my chief objection to this measure. My chief objection to this measure is that it would repeal the embargo on arms. We have discussed that.

But to come back to the particular point, the second proposition, does not the Senator know that warehouses in New York, that ships in New York, are loaded with merchandise, ready and waiting and expecting that the existing law will be repealed, and that this measure will be passed, and permit the shipment overseas of munitions and supplies? Does not the Senator know that since September 3 orders have been placed and continue to be placed in this country?

Mr. PEPPER. What is the pertinence of this possibility to the argument which the Senator is making?

Mr. DANAHER. There is no limitation on the placing of orders. There is no question that it has been represented to the public that this measure contained a cash-and-carry provision. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky blamed that on the press. He said the administration was not to blame for it. He said the press did it. He said the administration never called it a cash-and-carry measure, but the newspapers did that.

Mr. PEPPER. I thought the Senator was complaining about the permission or exception carried in section 7 (b).

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. In case the measure were adopted, I ask the Senator if he does not believe that the President's proclamation of the existence of a state of war in Europe would be practically, if not certainly contemporaneous, if it did not even precede the effective date of the legislation we are now considering?

Mr. DANAHER. May I ask if the Senator means the future proclamation to be issued under section 1 (a)?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. That is assuming the joint resolution should pass.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Of course, I should expect the President would issue a proclamation. I trust he would do so; but the pending measure does not require him to do so.

Mr. PEPPER. Let us suppose, then, this case, that the measure became law by its passage by both Houses of Congress, and its signature by the President. Does the Senator not think that at once the President would issue a proclamation under section 7 (a) which would announce a state of war to exist, which would make immediately effective the provisions of this law?

Mr. DANAHER. I should hope so.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well. If that be surmised, section 7 (b) says "The provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of such proclamation"—that is the proclamation we are discussing.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. So there would not be any authority or opportunity on the part of anyone to incur any of this questionable indebtedness insofar as section 7 (b) is concerned after the date of that proclamation.

Mr. DANAHER. From that date forward. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well. If the Senator admits that, then what the Senator is concerned about is the period between September 3 and the date of the proclamation which may be made under this measure, is that correct?

Mr. DANAHER. No. I knew what the Senator was going to say, if he will pardon the interruption. What I object to is the constant reiteration in one circle or another—we have heard it from Senators right on the floor of the Senate—that there is a cash-and-carry provision in this measure, and the public has been led to think that there is a cash-and-carry provision in this measure, and I say to the Senator, and the Senator will agree with me, I am certain, that there is no such provision, and that there is no such requirement in this measure.

Mr. PEPPER. May I pursue the inquiry a little further?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator quoted a moment ago from the existing law. The law, as I understood the quotation, forbids the extension of credit under its terms.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. So the Senator admits that there is now a law on the statute books which forbids the extension of credit since September 3 or 4, the date of the previous proclamation?

Mr. DANAHER. Curiously, however, limited to those things which are covered by the act. It will be recalled, Mr. President, that it applies only to the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and nothing else.

Mr. PEPPER. At least under the existing law no credit can be extended to any Government for the purchase of arms, ammunition, and implements of war?

Mr. DANAHER. Not legally.

Mr. PEPPER. All we are dealing with is the law.

So, Mr. President, what is the complaint the Senator has with regard to section 7 (b)? That is what I addressed myself to in the beginning. I tried to suggest that the committee was dealing with a situation in which it knew that thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of American citizens, in the enjoyment of their rights, have from time to time bought the bonds of governments or political subdivisions of governments which are now engaged in war; and we were trying to preserve the rights of those American citizens to accept refunding bonds, provided they agreed to do so as private individuals. The Senator was complaining about section 7 (b) and pointing out some vice it had. If the Senator wishes to address himself further to section 7 (b), I should like to hear him. However, if he is going to discuss the general question of cash-and-carry, I will say that I did not address myself to that question.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as I get on with this address I think I ought to ask Senators to reconsider the basis upon which they have approached the problem. I am certain that the minds of very few Senators are foreclosed upon this point. I prefer to think, with the Senator from Illinois, that as we canvass these situations together we may find various situations which ought to be corrected and various provisions which ought to be amended. Yesterday the Senator from Nevada himself offered an amendment; and there are yet other phases of this measure which very definitely ought to be explored.

I feel that undoubtedly the individual approach of many Senators to the question may have been influenced by a deep-seated sympathy for Poland. There is no one among us who would not thrill at the thought of the unsung hero who marshaled his gallant forces at Warsaw. But only a week ago last Sunday evening I heard a Senator tell a Nation-wide radio audience that he wanted to see Hitlerism crushed.

Mr. President, who will do the crushing? Suppose it appears that Hitlerism ought to be crushed. Who will do the crushing? What do you think were the feelings of those defenders of Warsaw who daily scanned the skies in vain for the sight of the airplanes of their Allies? Who is to crush Hitlerism? Are we? Are arms, ammunition, and implements of war to be sold on credit so that yet other

peoples, with whom we have no war, may be crushed? Is that to be the contribution of the United States to the crushing of Hitlerism? The sponsors of the joint resolution tell us that we will not pull the trigger. We will not bomb cities from the air. We will merely load the guns. We will merely make the bombs, and we will merely create engines of destruction that a people who have not wronged us as a nation shall be crushed; and we are to do it all—God save the mark!—in the name of keeping out of war. The way the joint resolution is drawn, we are not even to do it on a cash basis.

My own little girl recently said to me, "Daddy, what is the use of my studying history?" If that little girl is not getting any more from the study of her history than the proponents of this particular measure seem to have derived, it seems to me that her question is very apt. We extended credits before. We sold munitions before. We extended those credits, and we exported those munitions to the same nations who are now to get them.

At that time, in 1918, Sir Arthur Balfour said—and I quote:

I do not believe that the whole history of the world shows anything quite parallel or equal to the action of America in this war.

Said Marshal Foch on August 24, 1918:

You may tell the American people their soldiers are admirable. They ask nothing better than to go to their death. They can be reproached only with rushing ahead too fast. It is necessary to hold them back. Their ardor is unflagging.

But in 1926, Mr. President, the London Daily Mail said:

The British nation has been turned into a debt collector to the United States in Europe; but, unlike most debt collectors, we get all of the odium and none of the benefit.

The London Morning Post said:

Even if Europe is left with enough to buy one cotton shirt monthly, meat once weekly, and a pair of American shoes yearly, there will be a growing feeling of resentment against this Good Samaritan.

The London Daily News said in 1926:

It is just as well that Americans could understand how their action in regard to the debts is regarded throughout Europe. It may have contributed to make them the richest people in the world. It has made them out of all comparison the most unpopular.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a photostatic copy of the Washington Herald of August 1, 1926, which I procured from the Library of Congress. It is filled with extracts from leading journals in both France and England, showing the condition of affairs when Uncle Sam became "Uncle Shylock" to Europe.

I wish there were space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD properly to represent this entire page, but I would not think of asking unanimous consent to incur the expense involved. I ask those who are interested in the record of exactly what happened when our debtors turned on us in 1926, and what they said about us, to go to the Library of Congress and there find extracts—in fact, the original documents—which will show what happened in 1918 and 1919, when we made loans and credits to the Allies.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am very much interested in the citations which the Senator is reading. I think it would be of benefit to everyone if he would give the name of the publication and the page, so that we may observe them.

Mr. DANAHER. I shall be very glad to do so. They are contained in the Washington Herald for Sunday, August 1, 1926; and apparently the pages are 2 and 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to insert the matter referred to in the RECORD?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I fear that the value of the publication as such would not warrant the great cost involved. I shall not ask that it be inserted in the RECORD; but I have given the citation for reference in case anyone wishes to examine it further. There are many extracts, of which I have read only a few typical samples.

Mr. President, there is one other point with reference to the discussion the Senator from Florida and I had a few minutes ago, and that has to do with the date of the issuance of the proclamation. I wish the RECORD to show section 1 (a) of the pending measure so that Senators may be able in their own due time to make reference to it. It reads:

SECTION 1. (a) That whenever the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, shall find that there exists a state of war between foreign states, and that it is necessary to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States, the President shall issue a proclamation naming the states involved; and he shall, from time to time, by proclamation, name other states as and when they may become involved in the war.

Consequently, Mr. President, the way that language is worded, it is possible for the President to refuse to find that it is necessary. Notice in line 5 the word "necessary." It does not say "wise." It does not say "expedient" or "judicious." It says "necessary." Consequently, if the President shall find that a state of war exists, but fails to find that it is "necessary" to issue the proclamation, he may fail, and even refuse to do so.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. DANAHER. I gladly yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut called this phrase to my attention much earlier in the session, and I thank him for giving it the emphasis that he has in both of his discussions. I think it is worthy of reflection at this point that here is set forth in the joint resolution the purpose of the joint resolution; namely, national defense. The President must not only find the existence of a state of war between two foreign states, but he must find the necessity on the part of the United States—

to promote the security or preserve the peace of the United States or to protect the lives of citizens of the United States.

I thank the Senator for permitting me to call attention to that matter.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his observations.

Mr. President, since the section with reference to credits has to do entirely with the issuance of the proclamation in advance, or—to state it in another way—the issuance of the proclamation is a condition precedent to the operation of section 7 in its entirety, it may be, therefore, of interest to see just exactly what has been done in times past, in order to find a clue to why section 7 (b) is in the joint resolution.

According to reports of the Munitions Control Board sent to me from the Secretary of State, Great Britain, in January of this year, bought from the United States and took delivery of revolvers and automatic pistols to the total value of \$106.13; in February, none; in March, \$59.50; in April, none; in May, \$33.58; in June, \$472.69; in July, \$45; and in August, \$248.38. Remember, these shipments were made this year up to and including the 31st day of August, up to the very commencement of the war itself.

It is reasonable to assume that no credits were asked for these purchases. It is reasonable to assume that cash was paid and, Mr. President, I believe the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has made inquiry of the Secretary of State, and that a release was prepared with reference to that subject. I think the Baltimore Sun carried the story in Mr. Essary's column last week. I ask at this time unanimous consent, if I may have it, to submit later, to be included in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article which appeared in the Baltimore Sun on this particular subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, under section 7 (b) I claim that there is no limitation upon the placing by Great Britain of orders for unlimited amounts of revolvers and automatic pistols for use by her in the war. She may so contract with American producers that an indebtedness will

be created. She may write the terms of that indebtedness in any way that the contracting parties decide upon.

Mr. President, is it not perfectly clear why Great Britain was not arming in these particulars, notwithstanding the approach of the war? And is it not perfectly apparent now why the sponsors of this particular joint resolution have incorporated section 7 (b) in it?

Mr. President, according to the records, Great Britain took shipments from the United States in January of this year of ammunition for rifles in the total amount of \$1,019; in February, \$46; in March, \$4.06; in April, \$16.86; in May, \$27,536.39; in June, \$6; in July, \$807; in August, \$222.01. Remember, Mr. President, that in January our Chief Executive told us that—

A war which threatened to envelop the world in flames has been averted, but it has become increasingly clear that peace is not assured.

Two weeks ago he told us that—

By April new tensions had developed; a new crisis was in the making.

Surely Great Britain must have known at least as much about the possibilities of an impending war as we in this country knew; but such war orders, of course, need not be placed if unlimited indebtedness could be incurred without the slightest limitation whatever. Not even would the provisions of section 7 (a) apply, just so long as the indebtedness "may exist on the date of such proclamation."

In the 8 months ending August 31, 1939, Great Britain bought from us, in anticipation of those darker periods that may lie ahead, high explosives averaging about \$34,000 per month. Does Great Britain anticipate that the United States is to grant to her unlimited credits under which to prosecute her war?

In the 8 months of this year for which records are available Great Britain has taken delivery from us of aircraft adaptable to aerial warfare in the average amount of approximately two and one-half million dollars per month. Mr. President, under contracts already placed, under conditions of sale yet to be arranged, there is no prohibition whatever upon the incurring of indebtedness in any conceivable amount only so long as that indebtedness may exist on the date of the proclamation.

The significance of all this becomes apparent, Mr. President, when we recall that in his message to us on September 21 the President told us that there must not be a possibility of the creation of credits. He knew what the situation was between 1914 and 1915. He stated in his message to the joint session of the Congress that one of the objectives to be achieved by us—in fact, he called it his fourth objective—was the preventing of war credits to belligerents. When credits became extended in 1914, bond issues were floated. Loans were obtained. When we continued to ship arms and supplies to the Allies, while stringent necessity constantly reduced other belligerents, the sinking of ships began. In a thousand ways propaganda gradually whipped up American sympathy to a frenzy of interest. How rapidly it can be done again will become evident from realizing how rapidly it happened before.

Yet the sponsors of this joint resolution would undertake to imply to the Senate that section 7 (a) would grant our country protection against the extension of credits to belligerents. In making the point in his message that the extension of such credits should be prevented, the President clearly had in mind what every Senator here must know, that as credits continually increase, and as indebtedness mounts, the tendency will naturally be for us to undertake to protect our credits, to make sure that our debtors will not lose in the fight, in order that they may be in position to repay us. History has amply demonstrated to us that such a situation can be, as it has been, one of the factors operating upon the minds of our people as a possible inducing cause of our entry into war.

In November of 1916 President Wilson was reelected on the platform that "He kept us out of war"; yet less than 5 weeks after his inauguration as President in 1917 the

United States was in the war. I saw it happen then. I do not want to see it happen again.

If we unmask all pretense and discuss this legislation further from the standpoint of helping Great Britain and France, additional considerations engage our attention. Suppose Great Britain and France should win the war: Is it our thought that we should thereupon join them in destroying Germany? What would we decide to do—return Germany to her status of, let us say, 1860? Would we be satisfied if the armed power of the German people were confiscated? Would we thereupon undertake to destroy the Nazi libraries? Would we remove from the hearts of the German people their thoughts of years of starvation consequent upon our last effort to write a peace for Europe? Would we abstract from their thoughts the Nazi philosophy; or would we again, in the name of humanity and civilization, attempt to create a "democratic" government within her borders? Or can it be expected, Mr. President, that we would think, "with Herr Hitler out of the way, the German people will now be free"? Or may it not become apparent that with the British people bearing the highest taxes ever known, they may, with their French Allies, come through a devastating war, the flower of their remaining manhood gone, their economy devastated, and then find that Russia has risen to be the greatest menace of all?

The brutal, hideous truth of the matter is that we may yet find, like a ghastly joke, like a grim grotesqueness, that Great Britain will be forced to maintain—in fact, create—a strong Germany against the onrushing Russia; and then, Mr. President, in what position would the United States find itself were we to repeal the existing legislation? We do not know the Russian aims, except as we see Russia plunge upon prostrate Poland and dismember her bleeding corpse with cannibalistic glee, meanwhile effectively countering Germany's eastward march.

Or do we recall, a few short years ago, that the United States Senate itself approved the British protectorate over Palestine, only to find a policy in whose making we had no voice refute the aims and hopes and aspirations of thousands of persons who innocently and in good faith had acted on the British declaration?

There are in this Chamber Senators who can easily remember the destructive war which resulted in the loss of the lives of thousands of Boers—white men, civilized men, who lost their homes, their farms, their gold and diamond mines, their government, to British imperialism.

Not one here fails to remember that the United States, which entered the World War in 1917, came out of it with loss and debt, leaving thousands upon thousands of our boys enriching the mud of France, while Great Britain emerged in possession of practically every single military outpost in the world.

There is not the slightest justification in morals or in law for the people of the United States even to risk the possibility of being drawn into this war.

In any case let us assume that we are willing, indeed, to engage to furnish arms to Great Britain and France, but that we will remain adamant in our refusal to send our troops to help. The very least our diplomacy could and should do in any such given circumstance is to demand in advance that both Great Britain and France cede to us all island possessions which might constitute bases for foreign attacks upon our shores, for if we should remove such properties adjacent to our country, and necessary for its defense, from the possibility of their being transferred in a peace to an enemy nation, we would at the same time remove the possibility and the requirement of our going to war to defend against the seizure of those islands by an enemy nation. Under the Monroe Doctrine we would have no course to do other than act in our own protection and to go to war. Therefore, Mr. President, if we will remove that possibility in advance we can, if we debate the issue honestly and fairly, establish a quid pro quo, just as Great Britain herself does in every international stratagem in which she is involved.

I might illustrate by recalling that in the Spanish conflict Great Britain made a loan of \$20,000,000 to Franco, but

before doing so she obtained the right to enter the Pyrenees Mountains and abstract therefrom iron and copper ores. So she undertook, the moment she made a loan, to begin to "draw down"; and "draw down" she did. She sent a mission to Russia having in view possibly a loan to Russia, and only last Thursday a new trade agreement with Russia was announced by Great Britain.

Yet it is proposed that we consider even the possibility of going into this war by furnishing munitions, arms, and implements of war without even taking the elementary precaution to make sure that if Great Britain should lose the war we would not be drawn into a defensive war of our own.

The very least we could do, it seems to me, would be to take those first important steps for our own protection.

Mr. President, there is only one other point I wish to develop. In March of the present year testimony was read into the Record from General Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Corps, who told us that there were 879 combat planes in the hands of the United States Army. We had under discussion at the time the President's recommendation of an appropriation of \$300,000,000 for the creation of a 6,000-war-plane force. It was contemplated that we could build up to 3,000 planes by 1941. We had at the time 879.

If there be any possibility of an attack upon our shores—and I personally think it is grotesque and fantastic even to imagine such a thing—if there be any such possibility, we are the ones who need the munitions, and we are the ones who need the planes. I submit that a strong America will be an efficient bulwark against any attack on our shores.

I agree with Colonel Lindbergh that the repeal of the arms embargo is a step toward war. I believe that next would come the extension of credits, next would come the sending of men, completing our actual involvement in the war itself.

Mr. President, I believe the pending joint resolution is defective in the particulars which I have taken pains to illustrate, and I hope, and I want the Record to show that I hope, that it will be defeated.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 18, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, let Thy holy silence sink deep into our hearts that the truth we know may be the candle of the Lord. Hush all our complainings and discontent and give the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness. Let us rejoice and be glad that we have a part in the world's great work. Renew the life of Thy church everywhere, quicken its devotion and passion for the souls of men. Take the beam out of our own eye that we may see clearly to cast the mote out of our brother's eye. Restrain the wayward, relieve the oppressed, the poor, and be the toilers' friend. May pride, oppression, and all godless ambitions be remembered only as the things of the night. Let all who love the Lord Jesus stand for those virtues which build up the human heart in truth, honor, fidelity, love, and obedience to God. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein two letters, one signed by Francis B. Denton and the other by Gordon Auchincloss in answer to a letter placed in the daily Record a few days ago purporting to be

signed by Col. E. M. House. In this connection I also ask unanimous consent to include an editorial on the same subject from the New York Times of date October 14, 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein an address made by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler. I have received an estimate from the Public Printer to the effect that it exceeds the amount permitted ordinarily. I therefore renew my request at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therewith a very splendid address on the need for an increased air force in this country delivered by Mr. Horner, the President of the National Aeronautics Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a radio address I delivered last night at Station WOL, Washington, over a national network, on the subject, Our National Defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Record.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include therewith an editorial appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of this date.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein quotations from a speech made by the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes after the conclusion of the other special orders for the day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House heretofore made the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 45 minutes.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with the remarks I have prepared on the subject of neutrality, I wish to refer briefly to three subjects that have already been discussed here in the House.

I followed with a great deal of interest the questions asked by our colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] regarding a letter inserted in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON]. Twenty-one years ago Colonel House befriended me when I was 3,000 miles from home. I have always had a very warm spot in my heart for Col. E. M. House. For that reason, if for no other, let me state that I have read what purports to be a letter written by Colonel House inserted in the daily Record by the gentleman from Montana, and I want to state for the Record that I sincerely doubt its authenticity and feel very sure that the letter could not have been written and was not written by Colonel House. At this time when we are starting debate on a bill that is going to have a great effect on the future peace of this country, it seems to me to be ill-advised to insert in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD anything that would stir up racial or religious hatred. I express the hope that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKEKELSON], in view of all the circumstances and in view of the fact that he has stated on the floor that he does not know positively that the letter is authentic, that of his own volition he will withdraw that letter and keep it out of the permanent RECORD of the House.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Connecticut that I hope he and every Member of the House will read certain letters I will insert in the RECORD today under permission granted me a few minutes ago, one of them being from the secretary to the late E. M. House, who served him, I believe, some 40 years, and the other from his son-in-law, stating in very positive terms that that letter is a spurious document. So I join with the gentleman in the request that he makes and the hope he expresses, because it does seem to me that of all documents in this day and time that should reflect the absolute truth it is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am sure every Member of the House at all times, when he knows the facts, wants to preserve that as an honest, truthful record. I hope my friend will read these letters I am putting in the RECORD today which condemn that as a spurious document.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. When I put the letter in I did not say it was Colonel House. I made no claim to that effect. Another thing, I said to disregard the signer at the end of the letter, and in my remarks, if you will turn to the RECORD, I made that statement. I said to only read the substance matter of the letter and then compare that with conditions that have happened in the past 20 years. I have looked it up. It is stated in the letter that General Rodman was knighted by the British Government and the record is over here in the Congressional Library.

Mr. MILLER. I cannot yield any further unless the gentleman wants to withdraw the letter.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I just wanted to clear that up.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman stated on the floor of the House that the letter was signed by E. M. House, and in response to a question asked by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], he stated it was the Colonel House who was associated with President Wilson. His answer may be found on page 391 of the RECORD. I hope it will not be necessary to object to future unanimous-consent requests, which may be made by Mr. THORKEKELSON, which many of us feel constrained to do, unless the letter is withdrawn.

I had not intended to refer to the matter brought before the House a few days ago and referred to again yesterday, the formation of a committee known as the National Committee To Keep America Out of War, but apparently that is going to be brought up from time to time and I take this opportunity to say that I for one can see no objection to any group, even if they are Members of the House, forming themselves together as a committee for this purpose. I was invited to attend the meeting and I did attend the meeting at which time this committee was formed. I want the RECORD to show I am proud to belong to such a committee. The thought has been expressed that those who join such a committee imply that those who are not members of the committee want to lead the country into war. If some of us want to form an organization to perpetuate wildlife, that does not mean that all those who do not join that organization are in favor of the elimination of wildlife. In the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee yesterday he referred to that same matter. It seems to me it is the old story of those who are on one side insisting they are simply sending out facts, while the other side is issuing propaganda. It is the old saying, "My organization and the other fellow's gang."

I checked up on this matter and find that the stationery used by that committee has been paid for either by the committee or through contributions received by the committee. No material has gone out under the name of that committee

under anyone's frank. The postage has been paid on all mail put out relating to the work of the committee. I heard an offer made to the committee by a man who on his past record could have made good who offered to go out and raise \$100,000 for the purposes of the work of that committee, which offer was declined because there was no need of any such huge sum. There are a great many people, however, who feel they want to contribute to such a cause.

Mr. KITCHENS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. KITCHENS. I do not doubt the sincerity and desire of the gentleman who is speaking, but this particular organization has sent out, as I understand it, letters seeking contributions to enable it to carry on certain propaganda.

Mr. MILLER. To put out facts, if I may correct the gentleman.

Mr. KITCHENS. Are those contributions to be limited to people in this country and not to be accepted from people like this bund outfit up here? It is stated that this country is being flooded with propaganda by agents of Russia, Germany, and other countries. Will that committee accept funds from those agents?

Mr. MILLER. If the gentleman will read the names on that letterhead, I think he will feel perfectly confident they will have nothing to do with any German bund or any subversive organization.

Mr. KITCHENS. How can they tell?

Mr. MILLER. The committee will check the source of all donations.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. That committee will not try to sell the economic royalists our President's autographed books for \$250 each, through the Postmaster General, and shake down millions of dollars of campaign funds for New Deal political propaganda purposes, which include distributing portions of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by majority employees under the dome of the Capitol at an expense of many thousands of dollars.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman himself, or any Member on the floor now, know of any Congressman, whether or not he solicits a contribution, who would refuse one to his campaign fund so that he might be reelected, or who would refuse to send out from his own office in the House Office Building his own campaign material? Tell me the difference.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the gentleman from Michigan has put his finger on the point. There is not any difference. It is a political campaign and that is what I objected to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman from Virginia permit his secretary to send out letters written on the Congressman's time to his own personal friends? What is the difference?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Asking for funds to influence legislation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. He uses Government time and Government stationery to answer his own personal correspondence.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the gentleman kicks on sending out letters asking for contributions to send out arguments designed to keep us out of war?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I kick on taking up a collection for a committee under the dome of the Capitol to influence legislation pending before the Congress. It has never been done before in the history of the Government and it ought never to be done again.

Mr. HOFFMAN. From the Postmaster General, who is also chairman of the National Democratic Committee, right on down the line—from the Government offices on Government time this administration solicits contributions for political purposes, and to aid in getting those contributions official pressure is applied. Does not the gentleman aid his

campaign by accepting contributions for his own election to further his own views and the views of his party?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Surely; and what is the difference?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Does the gentleman admit that this is a political campaign? That is what I think it is.

Mr. MILLER. Now that we have disposed of that subject for the time being, at least, I should like to express the hope that when the neutrality bill, House Joint Resolution 306, finally reaches us in the House, we can have adequate time to consider and debate the bill properly. I certainly express the hope that when the bill reaches here partisanship will be completely eliminated. I would like nothing better than to see a row of chairs put right in this center aisle so that we can eliminate any division between the two parties. I would like to see the minority and the majority leaders exchange seats during this debate simply as a symbol that there is to be no partisanship.

I do not believe anyone on my right need feel any obligation or responsibility or loyalty to the President because he proposed certain provisions of the bill, and certainly no Member on my left should feel called upon to oppose any provision of the bill because it was proposed by the President, who is leader of the opposition party.

I asked for this time this morning, Mr. Speaker, not because I thought I had any great words of wisdom to impart but because I hoped to be able to make a few thought-provoking suggestions, and possibly raise a few questions in the minds of those who are in favor of repealing the arms embargo.

My good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], a few days ago, referred to the mail that he had received on this subject and mentioned that a good deal of it was undoubtedly put out by some organization that wanted to influence the outcome. I, too, have received an unusually heavy mail; at least, I am told by men who have been here a great many years that it is a heavy mail on any subject. Up until a few days ago; that is, from the opening of this special session until last Thursday, I have received from my district 3,212 letters or postal cards—that is, individual communications, and not including petitions—and only 373 of those were in favor of repealing the arms embargo.

I believe I should point out that I represent a district that has, within its limits, several munitions factories, and one of the largest manufacturers of aircraft engines and propellers. Among that mail were letters from men who are employed by a munitions factory, and by an aircraft factory, and these men said that while, undoubtedly, the repeal of the arms embargo would aid them in that they would get more money and would get overtime, they did not feel that the gamble was worth while, and they therefore urged that the embargo be continued.

Reference has been made to organized minorities sending these communications to Congressmen. I believe we can admit that that is just about 50-50—both sides are guilty. Out of the 373 communications I have received in favor of repeal, 126 were in the form of the postal card I hold in my hand, with my name and address printed on one side and the message printed on the other, leaving simply a space for the signature of the constituent. The message is this:

It is your duty to uphold the President of the United States. Vote for the repeal of the embargo provisions of the Neutrality Act.

Certainly any constituent has the right to sign this card, but undoubtedly it would be classified as organized propaganda inasmuch as it was printed by some individual or organization. Further, I do not believe the question before this House is whether or not we are to uphold the President of the United States. This is something that each Member of the House and the other body must decide in answer to his own conscience, and to his own constituents. It is not a case of upholding or defeating the President of the United States.

I should judge from a good deal of the mail I have received that many who have written to me are hysterical. One might think that we were considering a declaration of war, rather

than the enactment of neutrality legislation. I am not surprised that there is a good deal of hysteria throughout the country. There is a lot of it in my district. And why should there not be a good deal of hysteria when we read items such as the one printed in the Washington Post a week ago yesterday, purporting to be a War Department release, in which it was stated that the War Department had sent men to Chicago to issue instructions on the duties of a draft board. These things stir people up. If the people read that instructions are going out to potential draft boards, they, of course, think that war is just around the corner.

They also read that control of the Panama Canal has been taken away from the civil body and turned over to the Army, whereas the Panama Canal Act states definitely that this shall be done only in case of war or when war is imminent. There, again, it is not surprising that those who are aware of this situation rightfully feel that in the opinion of their Government war is imminent.

Throughout all the thought I have been able to give to this subject of neutrality, and throughout the debate I have listened to in the other body, and the excellent addresses that have been made on this floor, there keeps recurring to my mind this thought, "If only we could be sure"; because I am positive there is not a man in this body or connected with this Government in any capacity who would willfully or intentionally do anything that would lead this country into war.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I wish to inquire whether the gentleman does not believe it is a wise move on the part of our Government, in view of the espionage that is now going on in our own country, to take every precaution to preserve the Panama Canal and prevent any incident there that might obstruct it.

Mr. MILLER. Certainly, the Panama Canal should be protected, but I believe it could be protected under the control of the civilian authorities with the help of the Army. The Panama Canal Act very distinctly states that control shall be turned over to the Army only in case of war or when war is imminent. I do not feel that war is imminent and we do not want the people throughout the country to believe that this is a step taken because war is imminent, because to many that means just tomorrow.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It is not a question of whether the civil or the military authorities do the work; it is a question of getting the results down there. It is highly important, as the gentleman will admit, to preserve the Panama Canal.

Mr. MILLER. Right; but I believe it could be done under civil authority.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does not the gentleman know that we have already convicted about eight or nine spies in this country representing foreign governments, who had in their possession certain plans for the purpose of destroying certain things that were quite important to our national defense?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; but most of those arrests and prosecutions were made by civil authorities and not by the military intelligence, and I believe control of the Panama Canal should have continued as it was.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Do you not believe, in view of the fact which I have stated here two or three times, that we had at one time over 300 spies in this country representing foreign governments, that the Panama Canal would be the finest spot in the world to seek to destroy?

Mr. MILLER. I agree that it should have every possible protection. There is no doubt about that.

It seems to me considerable effort has been made on the part of some columnists to convey to the country the thought that this neutrality battle is all over. I read a few days ago—a week ago today, to be exact—an article by Jay Franklin appearing in a Washington paper, in which he said that the debate in the other body had petered out and that there

was only a lackadaisical interest in the debate on the neutrality resolution.

There is not a Member of this body who has gone over to the other body since the debate was opened but has seen a line extending all the way down stairs, with people from all over the country trying to get into the galleries. To be sure, there are empty seats, possibly, in the diplomatic gallery or certain sections that are reserved; but John Q. Public is very much interested in that debate, and the fight is far from over. All we have to do is to witness the interest evidenced on the part of the people who visit Washington, as well as those who write to us.

Before long we will have here in the House a Bloom bill; in fact, there is now nothing left of the Bloom bill as we passed it in the House but the title, and for that reason I have expressed the fear we will not have adequate debate when that bill comes back here.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Has there been any assurance given on the part of the leaders that some program is going to be worked out so that the bill can be debated fully?

Mr. MILLER. I have not had any such assurance, but I have confidence that the leaders on both sides of the House will insist on adequate debate under the rules of the House, and I will be very much surprised and disappointed if that does not happen.

There has been an effort on the part of a good many who have addressed themselves to the subject of repealing the arms embargo to misstate the issue now before the Congress. It is not a question of whether we shall repeal or whether we shall keep the arms embargo or whether we shall repeal it or shall accept the new resolution, House Joint Resolution 306. Certainly we can continue our arms embargo and then add other provisions or other measures that have been proposed that would certainly strengthen our neutrality. We can have the arms embargo and also have these other protective measures. The thing I am afraid of is that if we repeal the arms embargo we will start a chain of events that we cannot stop—a chain that will take us into war.

It has been said that the democracies of Europe are fighting our battle; that they are upholding democracy, that they are going to stop Hitler, that they are fighting our war. If there is any Member of the Congress who feels that is true, that it is a question of whether democracy shall survive, then why should we debate the provisions of a neutrality bill and discuss cash and carry? If I thought that on the outcome of this war depended the future and the continuation of democracy, as we know it in the United States, I would not waste any time discussing cash and carry. I would not say to those who are fighting our battles, "Yes, we will help you with munitions, providing you put the gold on the barrel head." If I felt that way I would be tempted to rush home and take the hand controls off the old "Chevy" and put them on an airplane and go over and fight our own battle.

I think this country and the world generally recognizes the difference between arms and ammunition and other commodities. Arms and ammunition fundamentally and primarily are commodities of death, but all other commodities are fundamentally commodities of life. The criticism has been offered that our neutrality does not go far enough, that we embargo arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and then permit the unfinished material to be shipped to Europe. As I read the Neutrality Act, as it is now on our books, I see no reason why the President cannot add to the embargo list those materials that can be used to make implements of war. As a matter of fact, I think under any reasonable definition, copper tubing could be held to be of like character to copper shells, and if it is the failure of our Government that we have not gone far enough, certainly we can go further without repealing the act.

I have been interested to read a good deal of the diplomatic correspondence that passed between this Government and the Governments of Great Britain and France between 1914 and 1917, and through all of that diplomatic correspondence what is the only subject of controversy? It is not wheat, it

is not cotton, not corn, but it is munitions—traffic in arms, and we find throughout that correspondence that that particular topic always recurs. Therefore, it is reasonable to believe and understand that our arms embargo is a symbol of honest neutrality. I ask you to think back to 1914, to 1917, and particularly during the fall of 1916, when President Wilson was re-elected on a platform or the slogan that he kept us out of war. I believe President Wilson was absolutely honest in his desire to keep this Nation out of war. I believe from reading the remarks of Members of Congress in this House, made in 1916, when they said they would support this measure or that measure, they would vote for this or that, but they would not vote to actually participate in war that they were sincere, and still, in less than 5 months from the time Mr. Wilson was elected in 1916, because of events beyond his control, we were actively in that war, and that is why I think there is very real danger that we are starting on a series of events, starting a chain of events, that will lead us into a position where we will have to eventually get into the war, that we will be taking the first step toward war if we repeal the embargo.

I shall read now a few quotations, very brief quotations, taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and some from correspondence between our State Department and the British State Department. First I read from the memoirs of Lloyd George in which he said:

If we were interfering with America's potential trade with our enemies, at least we were providing her with a magnificent market in Britain, France, and Russia, which stimulated her industries to an unprecedented level of activity and profitability. This fact had its influence in holding back the hand of the American Government whenever, excited to intense irritation by some new incident of the blockade, it contemplated retaliatory measures.

Further I read:

Thus by the end of the year 1914 the traffic in war materials with the Allies had become deeply entrenched in America's economic organization, and the possibility of keeping out of the war by the diplomacy of neutrality, no matter how skillfully conducted, had reached the vanishing point. By October, perhaps earlier, our case was lost. While British diplomacy maneuvered with skill to involve American industry and finance in the munitions traffic, it is certain that American business needed no compulsion to take war orders.

That is a quotation from the Life of Woodrow Wilson, by Ray Stannard Baker. Then further on we read of a cablegram sent by Ambassador Page to the Secretary of State in which he makes this dire prediction:

Perhaps our going to war is the only way in which our present preeminent trade position can be maintained and panic averted. I think that the pressure of this approaching crisis has gone beyond the ability of the Morgan financial agency for the British and French Governments.

That is from a cablegram from our Ambassador to President Wilson.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. As a matter of fact, was not that message given to the President of the United States less than 1 month before President Wilson appeared in this Chamber and asked the Congress to declare war on Germany?

Mr. MILLER. Less than 1 month.

Thus by the end of 1914 traffic in war materials with the Allies had become deeply entrenched in America's economic organization, and the possibility of keeping out of war had reached the vanishing point.

That from Ray Stannard Baker in his Life of Woodrow Wilson.

Now, is it not reasonable to say that if we repeal the arms embargo, in view of what took place in this country in 1914 to 1917, that we are, in all probability, taking the first step to war; that we are starting on a series of events which might well repeat the history of 1914 to 1917? That our whole economic set-up, that our industries, that our capitalistic structure will be geared up to supplying the European countries with war material, and no matter what happens we will find that we are facing a situation where we may then realize that we made a mistake in this special session, and we will

not be able to do anything about it in 1914, and more than could the Congress and the President in 1916 and early 1917.

I believe that this recent history is in the minds of those who say flatly that the repeal of the arms embargo is a step in the direction of participation in the existing war.

One more word about this thought that we do not go far enough in our embargo: At the present time we prohibit the sale of narcotics, but not other harmful drugs, such as veronal and barbitol, that we know are harmful; and then we find marihuana being sold throughout the country. But does anybody get up here and say we do not bar veronal or barbitol, and they are harmful to young people who are buying them, and wrecking their lives? Just because we do not bar those things nobody proposes that we lift the ban that we have on narcotics. Is it not just as reasonable to say that if we do not go far enough in our arms embargo, that the sensible thing is to go a little further? If those who feel that our present law is unneutral because Germany can obtain munitions coming from the United States, through other neutral countries, a very simple amendment would correct that evil, and it could be passed almost overnight. We would simply say that in the future we are going to embargo arms, ammunition, and implements of war to all countries. Then there will be no question of any of it getting into Germany illegally or getting into France and Great Britain illegally.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Gladly.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. As a matter of fact, does not the gentleman believe that inasmuch as it is the belligerents themselves who determine for themselves and for the rest of the world what contraband of war is, that we should confine our embargoes to everything that either of the belligerents may determine to be contraband of war?

Mr. MILLER. I honestly believe that. I said on this floor in June that as far as I was concerned, the profit on our foreign business with those countries at war is such a comparatively small sum that if I could have my way I would stop doing business with countries during the period of time they were at war. I would not worry about any financial loss.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman have the figures, in dollars and cents, covering arms and ammunition purchased by France, Great Britain, and Germany prior to the declaration of World War No. 2?

Mr. MILLER. I am sorry I do not have them here.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. Is it not true that an army marches on its stomach today, the same as it did in Napoleon's day?

Mr. MILLER. Of course it does; but I have tried to point out that in the minds of the people of this country and the world generally there is a difference between arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and food.

Mr. PATRICK. Where is the point of demarcation between the things that will aid a country at war and the things the gentleman first mentioned? In other words, if we follow the logic of embargo, why sell anything to any nation that is at war?

Mr. MILLER. I said I would like to do that.

Mr. PATRICK. Then, following that further, as other neutral nations do carry that on through, if the logic of the position taken by the gentleman is sound, why, then, when nations are at war, should this country sell anything to anybody?

Mr. MILLER. I just finished saying that is exactly what I would like to do, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] said he would like to embargo everything that is on the lists of the belligerent nations as contraband.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. As a matter of fact, I think the gentleman will agree that the belligerents themselves determine what shall be considered contraband of war, and I just said so.

Mr. MILLER. Yes. I now yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEYER of California. I like what the gentleman has said. I like his philosophy today. I am particularly concerned with just exactly what his action would be if he would embargo everything to all warring nations, on the resulting unemployment, when I am mindful of the votes the gentleman cast when our W. P. A. bills were up here, to put 1,000,000 people off and refuse to put the other 1,000,000 on. I am wondering how the gentleman would react to that.

Mr. MILLER. I shall be pleased to answer the gentleman's question by saying that the goods that we will deliver to the countries now at war during the period of time they are at war will not amount to the snap of a finger in our unemployment problem.

Mr. GEYER of California. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MILLER. It would not be the first time.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman from Connecticut realize that for the past 10 years 40 percent of our export trade went to the British Empire and Dominions?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; I so understand. I would, however, rather pass that up than to have this country become involved in trade in the implements of war. In my opinion, we would be better off if we did not do business with belligerent nations at all during wartime, but at the same time I would insist that belligerent nations not interfere with our right to trade with neutrals. By developing trade with the neutrals we would far more than offset any loss we might sustain by stopping business with the belligerents.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman realize the disastrous effect of the embargo which was enforced in the administration of Thomas Jefferson? It nearly paralyzed our whole economy.

Mr. MILLER. There is a great difference of opinion about that. I do not think the gentleman's statement is necessarily absolutely correct.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman indulge me a moment further?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman really believe that the United States, dependent as it is on imports of tin, nickel, manganese, and rubber, can isolate itself from the rest of the world? Suppose, in retaliation for this complete embargo, which it virtually would be, these other nations cut off our imports of those essential raw materials?

Mr. MILLER. Has there been any threat of retaliation because of our embargo?

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Certainly they are not going to take it lying down.

Mr. MILLER. They have so far.

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. For a brief question; yes.

Mr. KITCHENS. Does the gentleman realize that embargoes of one character or another have caused practically all the wars of the world?

Mr. MILLER. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Does the gentleman realize that if we were to embargo all these things it would have a tendency to drive that part of American industry which makes these munitions into foreign countries—into Argentina, Brazil, Canada—and that that would become a very live threat to our market in the depression that would follow the war? They would then put themselves in competition with our domestic manufacturers, and on the basis of competition get the greatest market in the world, the American

market. They would destroy our market by reason of their low-priced labor.

Mr. MILLER. I may say to the gentleman that so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to banish from this country wartime trade in munitions.

As to the balance of the gentleman's question, I may say that I believe there is not a country in the world doing business with us today because they love us. They are buying from us because we have what they need at a price they can pay. They will continue doing so after the war is over.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. That is true; but after the war the industries which have moved to those foreign countries will turn their machines from the manufacture of arms, armament, and ammunition into the manufacture of machinery and the commodities of peace, competing for the greatest market in the world. They will not bother us while war is on, but after the war is over they will flood our market with their cheap goods.

Mr. MILLER. Along that line let me read, in answer to the gentleman's question, what President Wilson said on the 26th day of October 1916 in a speech at Cincinnati, Ohio. He said:

If you take the figures of our commerce, domestic and foreign included, you will find that the foreign commerce, even upon a modest reckoning of our domestic commerce, does not include 4 percent of the total; and the exports in munitions—and not merely in munitions but in everything that goes to supply arms—draft animals, automobiles, trucks, food directly intended for that purpose, shoes, clothes, everything that is needed by the commissary of an army—that all of these things put together do not constitute 1 percent of the total of our commerce.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. I realize that that is true, and I, too, do not care about the 1 percent of our exports. The thing in which I am interested and about which I am fearful is the 99 percent of our market and the way it will suffer from competition from the outside. Their cheap goods will be imported into this country; we will not export. Those cheap goods will have a disastrous effect on the 99 percent of our own home market.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman must remember that this is wartime, and those nations and people are not going to be bothering much about foreign trade while the war lasts.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. But after the war they will get it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 15 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORBETT. While the gentleman is interrupted will he yield briefly?

Mr. MILLER. Gladly.

Mr. CORBETT. I would like, only because I happen to have done exhaustive research work in the period of history covered by the Jefferson embargos, to correct at least in part the impression that is left by the statements that the Embargo and Nonintercourse Acts helped involve us in the War of 1812 and certain other sequences. It is a matter of record that the Jeffersonian embargo was put into effect in 1807 and continued in effect only until 1809. The Nonintercourse Act was adopted as regards England and France as economic sanctions in order to force France to withdraw the Berlin and Milan decrees and in order to force Great Britain to withdraw the famous orders in council. In other words, those two measures were basically designed as economic warfare against England and France. If we recall our history a bit further, England and France were notified that if they withdrew their restrictions regarding our commerce we would withdraw our restrictions regarding theirs.

In the year 1810 France, by subterfuge, withdrew the Berlin-Milan decrees, and we lifted the Nonintercourse Act as regards that country. We might as well know once and for all that the embargo under Jefferson was an economic sanction and not a neutrality measure. Further, we might as well know that the embargo only affected the commercial sections of our country, and while it was economic hardship on those

particular sections, the rest of the country suffered none at all in what was the most prosperous period, 1792 to 1812, in the history of the United States. I submit any reliable historian on that point.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I hope that in the next few days we can perhaps have that matter debated, because it is an interesting period in our history and of particular interest at this time.

Let us leave the subject we are discussing for the moment and direct our attention to the reasons this country had for the adoption of the Neutrality Act in 1935 and the amendments in 1936 and 1937. It seems to me that we adopted the neutrality law in 1935 for just one reason, because it was our thought it would be a step in the direction of keeping the United States out of some future foreign war. We never hoped it would stop wars in Europe, but we did hope, and I believe the Congress was right at that time, in believing it would keep us from becoming involved in any foreign wars.

Back of that I think the exposures of the Nye committee had a good deal to do with the action of the Congress at that time. Then, too, I think it was partly at least in response to requests of veterans' organizations in this country. I know for several years prior to 1935 the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars urged the adoption of a Neutrality Act. For these three reasons the bill was finally adopted in 1935, reenacted, approved, and amended in 1937.

There are many Members of the present Congress who voted for that Neutrality Act. I could insert in the RECORD editorials from newspapers in 25 leading cities of the United States approving the action of Congress in 1935 and 1937. The President of the United States in the strongest possible words approved the neutrality legislation in the Chautauqua, N. Y., address referred to by my colleague from New York [Mr. REED], where he made the much-discussed fool's gold speech.

It is well to be reminded of that, because the President in his message to Congress gave us as his unalterable opinion that repeal of the arms embargo would most likely keep us out of war. He based that statement on the fact that he had for a number of years been a student of international affairs and world peace. It is reasonable for all of us to believe that the major part of that "large number of years" or "long number of years" must have been prior to 1936. Yet in 1936 he said that this neutrality legislation had put new tools in his hands, tools he could use to keep us out of some future war. He issued the warning that the thing we had to fear most if war broke out on some other continent was the fact there would be thousands in this country who, through a desire for fool's gold, would urge repeal or evasion of the Neutrality Act. It is tragic to think of those who felt that way in 1936 now leading the move to repeal the act, perhaps not for fool's gold. I would not for a moment charge, and I do not think, that the President of the United States would willfully and intentionally do anything to involve us in a war.

However, being human, I think he may err, and from that error—and I believe this House has certainly indicated a belief that a repeal of the embargo would be an error—we might become involved in war.

In the President's message and in some addresses made on the floor of the House it has been urged that we repeal the arms embargo, repeal certain other parts of our Neutrality Act, and go back to international law. Most of us know that international law is simply what the most powerful nation in the world, the nation having control of the seas, chooses to say it is. It is rather interesting to note what one of the leading proponents of the new resolution had to say about our relying on international law in 1937. Speaking at the University of Nevada, Senator PITTMAN said:

They proclaim we shall rely on international law. We will have our own restraining laws during war. We relied upon international law prior to the World War, and it was our undoing.

What has happened since to change the minds of these people who felt just 2 short years ago that to rely on international law would be our undoing, as it was in 1917?

I would like to ask this question, and I pause for any Member of Congress to answer: Is there any Member of this House who voted for the Neutrality Act of 1937 who heard any great amount of criticism of his vote when he went back home? I did not hear any. The man who represented the district I now represent came back and, like most of the Members of Congress in 1936 to 1938, was proud of his part in placing on our statute books the neutrality law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Quite to the contrary. The Members of Congress who voted for the Neutrality Act were praised by their people for enacting a law which was one step in the direction of keeping this country out of any foreign conflict.

Mr. MILLER. It was used by Members of this House on both sides. They were proud of the part they played in the writing of that legislation.

It has been stated during the discussions we have had in the House that we should have dealt with this subject last June; that we should have passed the Bloom bill; then we would not have had to come back in special session. Still, it is said that one of the most important parts of this new resolution is the restriction on our shipping. The record of this House will show that if there is any responsibility for leaving the subject of the restriction of shipping out of the Bloom bill, that responsibility must lay with the majority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 84, page 7990, the words of my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], where he stated:

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, I am authorized to announce, in order to eliminate certain features of the bill which are objectionable to some Members of the House, the acting chairman of the committee [Mr. Bloom], after consulting with a majority of the Democratic members of the committee, and with their concurrence and support, will offer amendments to change the bill as reported in the following particulars:

(1) In section 2 of the bill, strike out the provision making it unlawful for citizens of the United States to travel on vessels of belligerent nations, and substitute in lieu thereof "that no citizen of the United States shall travel upon vessels of belligerent nations, except at his own risk."

(2) Strike out all of section 3, relating to areas of combat operations.

If we had passed the Bloom bill as it was recommended to this House by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, in my humble opinion, we would still have been called back in special session to enact these necessary shipping restrictions.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Briefly.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Is it not also true that administration forces took out section 9, which made it unlawful for American ships to carry arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents?

Mr. MILLER. I believe so; I am not sure.

There is no question in anybody's mind but that the vast majority of the citizens of this country have a very strong feeling in favor of the Allies, in favor of Britain and France, and that they want to see Hitler defeated, and Hitlerism and all it stands for eliminated from the face of the earth. With this sentiment I wholeheartedly agree. Let the most profane man in this House express his opinion of Hitlerism, and I will gladly accept it without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t."

While it may be all right and undoubtedly is all right, although not good psychology, for the people of this country to have that strong feeling, I do believe that when a Member of Congress comes up on Capitol Hill and goes to his office, or comes through the door onto this floor, he should bear in mind, always, that he is dealing with friendly nations. As far as I know, our diplomatic relations are not even strained with any nation on the face of the earth. We must keep before us the thought that we as Members of Congress, at least, are writing legislation that will affect not unfriendly but at least at the present time friendly nations.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has expressed his abhorrence of Hitlerism.

Mr. MILLER. Right.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman realize that the present arms embargo certainly plays into the hands of Hitler?

Mr. MILLER. I do not know. I believe I can prove that it does not.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Some nations are strong land powers.

Mr. MILLER. Yes. Will the gentleman allow me to come to that point a little later? I have it here. If I do not cover it, I shall be pleased then to yield to the gentleman.

As we go on in this debate, I think I can truthfully say I do not care a rap what effect our legislation may have on Britain, France, Germany, Russia, or any other country on the face of the earth; but it does seem to me that we are reaching the point in this discussion, judging from the discussions on the radio, in the other body, and on this floor, where the question is becoming, not one of neutrality, but of how far we can go in "an act short of war" to aid the side the majority of our people want to see win. Let me quote very briefly statements made during this debate on the radio and elsewhere by leaders of the group that favor repeal; statements that, in my humble opinion, indicate that these men are not neutral and are not trying to write a neutrality act, but instead are trying to write legislation that will aid the Allies. I quote:

Americans must do everything they can to hasten the victory of the Allies.

That by a Member of Congress, who must vote on this bill. Is that neutrality? Maybe it is right, but it is not neutrality.

We must make it possible for Great Britain and France to get supplies. We do not need to ask whether the bill is neutral.

And again:

The present law is not working neutrally in Europe.

And again:

Let us forget impartiality, hence neutrality, and take sides and fight.

In my humble opinion, that is not neutrality.

The Neutrality Act to which today we are considering amendments never was a neutrality act. It should have been called an act to keep the United States out of war.

In the name of all that is holy, what is the matter with that? If that is what the act is that we have on our statute books, then let us not amend it; let us not repeal it; let us keep the act we have which, as one opponent of repeal says, is an act to keep the United States out of war.

Another quotation:

It favors the belligerents that we want favored by giving them a chance of coming here with their ships and buying our goods.

Then the quotation goes on that the present law has not worked neutrally in Europe.

It was said yesterday that we give aid to the aggressor and deny it to the victims of the aggressor. Those were not the exact words of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, who expressed it much better than I can, but that was his thought—that we before the war aided in the arming of Hitler and now we have denied to his victims the munitions they may need.

These points are easy to check. It is interesting to note that in the last 8 months this country has shipped abroad a total of \$58,500,000 worth of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, \$22,664.94 of which went to Germany and the balance to Great Britain, France, and her allies. If that is all that is bothering us, as I said in the early part of my remarks, a simple amendment barring the shipment of munitions to neutrals would carry out our purpose.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Germany did not have to come over here and buy those arms from us. She took them

when she took Czechoslovakia and Austria. She took the great munitions factories of Europe by aggression.

Mr. MILLER. I will say to the gentleman that 2 years ago, which was before Hitler took Czechoslovakia, Germany was armed to the teeth, and I think the gentleman will agree with that.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman answer one question for me?

Mr. MILLER. If I can; yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman think that Hitler wants the present arms embargo repealed or maintained?

Mr. MILLER. Well, if I answer that with just the thought that comes to my mind, you may say that I am rude, but I honestly feel that I do not give a darn what he wants. [Applause.] I do not mean to be rude.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Does not his attitude or the attitude of his controlled press show that the arms embargo is a great aid to him at the present time?

Mr. MILLER. The controlled press?

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. His controlled press.

Mr. MILLER. That is something that we might be able to debate in the next few days, and the thought was expressed by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], I believe yesterday, that because of the submarines in the Atlantic it was quite possible that the shipment of munitions through the Pacific and then into Germany would be much easier than such shipments to the Allies, which was an interesting thought.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee for 2 years, does not the gentleman think that we exhibited a good deal of short-sighted statesmanship in this Chamber in not visualizing in advance the exact situation that confronts us today?

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows how I feel from the amendment which I offered at the last session.

Mr. MILLER. I was coming to that and was going to say that when the matter was before the Congress in 1935 and 1937, we knew then that Great Britain and France were sea powers and that Germany was a land power, and that these other land powers conceded that they were going to be the victims of the Versailles Treaty, and the proponents of the Versailles Treaty knew that. We knew that in 1935 and 1937, and still we wrote the law, knowing that and knowing what the most likely outbreak was going to be.

I think I have time for just about one more thought. Within 48 hours of the opening of this session I made inquiry of our State Department and asked one of the able men over there if he would suggest to me four or five names of men whom they considered outstanding authorities on international law, because I am not even a common garden variety of lawyer and I wanted some good advice. I had submitted to me five names—Professors Jessup and Hyde, of Columbia, and Professors Beamis and Griswold, of Yale, and another one whose name I do not recall, but he was secretary of the Wickersham committee in 1926, a committee appointed to codify international law. I wrote these gentlemen and asked them whether, in their opinion, repeal of the arms embargo under existing circumstances would be an unneutral or an unfriendly act, and all five of them said it would be, and Professors Jessup and Hyde have outlined their position in letters appearing in the New York Times, which have been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is interesting to note that they all agree that we cannot repeal the arms embargo, but none of them say that we cannot change our Neutrality Act. We can change our Neutrality Act to strengthen it, but we cannot change it in order to help one or the other of the belligerents, and this, in my opinion, is the difference between repealing the embargo and putting into effect the cash-and-carry provisions on other commodities that may be just as useful, because the cash and carry is distinctly a strengthening of our neutrality, and writing into law the terms under which we will sell those commodities, and it does not in any way deprive any nation from getting supplies, because every Member of the House knows that every

country can, if it wants to, put its money on the line for the supplies they need from the United States.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. Would the gentleman tell us in dollars and cents how much was spent by the Allies in this country during the first World War for guns and ammunition?

Mr. MILLER. I have not the figures here.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, while I cannot answer the question as the gentleman from Kansas puts it, I can say that our sale of arms and ammunition amounted to less than 10 percent of our total exports.

Mr. MILLER. I was going to say that I think we overrate arms and ammunition, and, as a matter of fact, many of the Members here will remember that we could not furnish our own arms and ammunition even when that war closed because we were still using French planes and French guns.

Mr. HOUSTON. And we were drilling our soldiers with broomsticks.

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. I do not think in the event of repealing this law we will sell any guns and ammunition to amount to a tinker's dam.

Mr. MILLER. Yesterday my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. COURTNEY] expressed the thought that repeal would improve our national defense. The effect repeal of the arms embargo would have upon our national defense is one thing that would cause me to vote against repeal, and I base that statement on the experience of 1914 to 1917, because we find in 1917, when we went to war, that our munition factories were geared up and tooled up for foreign governments. Most of those factories were in my own State of Connecticut, and when our own Government wanted rifles we found that it would take so long to change over from the tooling necessary for Enfield to turn out Springfields that our own Government had to take Enfields, admitting that they were an inferior rifle; and when we were discussing the preparation for bringing our aircraft up to the strength we think it should have it was brought out that it would be impossible to meet our own needs in less than a year, and I am informed by the best opinion that I can get that, with our own aircraft industry geared up as it is, it will take about 14 months to turn out our own needs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLK). The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Has the gentleman in mind answering the question put a moment ago, whether the keeping of the embargo is and will be a definite aid to Hitler?

Mr. MILLER. I shall try to answer it. It is a matter of opinion.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I am waiting for that answer, as it is a matter of great interest to me. I certainly do not want to aid the dictators. I hold that our own long-range interests and safety are paramount.

Mr. MILLER. I do not think it has any effect on Hitler. I think Hitler is armed to the teeth and that with their resources they do not need our munitions.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I wanted to get the gentleman's view on that point.

Mr. MILLER. It is only a matter of opinion.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. I do not want to interrupt the interesting discussion, but is it not a well-known fact that there are many airplanes now on the Atlantic border ready to be shipped across the ocean if the embargo is repealed?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Is not that an aid to Hitler, in denying England and France those planes?

Mr. MILLER. I may be all wrong, but I have tried my best to find out, and I honestly doubt that there is any shortage of airplanes or munitions in either Great Britain or France, and the probabilities are that there will not be for at least a year. I think they are well equipped for a year, which would cause me to believe that there is no need for rushing into this thing. Circumstances may change, and, rather than see Hitler win, we might want to take some other position.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Is it not a well-known fact that they have millions of money in this country, put here months ago, with which they bought these planes?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. And if what you say is true, why did they buy many planes many months ago?

Mr. MILLER. For a long war, I would say.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They have been selling us gold for the last 4 years and we have been paying them a premium of \$14 an ounce on it. They have sold about \$8,000,000,000 worth of it—

Mr. MILLER. Let us not get into gold. [Laughter.] I would like to insert this letter in the RECORD. It tends to prove that our Government in 1915 took the position that to repeal the arms embargo, or in that case it was to put on an arms embargo, would be an unneutral act. I want to quote from this letter of the Secretary of State in 1915, in which he replied to Germany's objection to our furnishing ammunition to the Allies. The Secretary of State said:

This Government holds that any change in its own laws of neutrality during the progress of a war, which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war, would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality. The placing of an embargo on the trading in arms at the present time would constitute such a change and be a direct violation of the neutrality of the United States.

It is just as true today, in reverse English, as it was in 1915. It has been said on this floor that every other neutral who can do so, is selling arms to warring nations; particularly, it has been emphasized, to Hitler. There again I sat down and wrote to 12 of the embassies in Washington and asked them what legislation their countries had and whether they were embargoing arms at the present time, and in some cases whether they did during the World War. I found out from those various embassies that at the present time Belgium, Denmark, Sweden, Holland, the Netherlands, and numerous South American countries are not permitting the shipment of arms, munitions, or implements of war beyond their own borders. Most of them are what we would like to think of as the great neutral powers of Europe. It is with those powers and countries like that, countries like Switzerland, that I want to see the United States at least tied up with in thought.

Now, suppose the Congress in its wisdom decides, whether it is neutral or not, we are going to pass this resolution, and we do not care whether it is neutral. I would like to direct attention to the Pacific coast, because I am sure the people of this country who want to aid Britain and France do not want to aid Japan. That is just what you will do if you repeal the arms embargo, because you take away from Japan the only excuse they have for not declaring war. They would then declare war, and in the Pacific Japan is the country that controls the sea, and China, the victim of the aggressor, is the country that will suffer. We cannot legislate for the Atlantic in one way and for the Pacific in another. I would like to have time to develop the effect of repeal of the arms embargo on Japan. Perhaps that can be done at some other time.

One other thought: About 10 days following the address of the President of the United States to Congress, I went to the Library to see if I could find out the reaction of the European press, because, after all, we like to know what the people of the world are thinking about us. Without exception, every paper I found took the position, and I think rightfully so, that the United States was taking sides; that we were going

in with our own Allies to a limited extent; that we were going into the war on the economic front against Germany.

That came up in 1914 to 1917. It is surprising how many of these things we face today we can find the answer to in the history of 1914 to 1917. On May 8, the day after the sinking of the *Lusitania*, Ambassador Page reported that the official opinion in Great Britain was that the United States must declare war or forfeit her self-respect. The President said it was a serious thing to have such things thought, because everything that affects the opinion of the world regarding us affects our influence for good. That is just as true today.

I saw an interesting quotation the other day from the Windsor Daily Star, in which they say that the arms-embargo clause of the Neutrality Act will be repealed "for a starter" and "next, America will be in the war along about the middle of January."

If I can express just one closing thought: I hope that we can try to keep our feet on the floor; that we will not be influenced by partisanship, and that we will not get unreasonable. I saw a statement the other day referring to Lindbergh's speech the other night in which it stated, "Lindbergh's speech encourages the ideology of the totalitarian government and is subject to the construction that he approves of the brutal conquest of democratic countries through war or the threat of destruction through war." It is those unfavorable and unreasonable statements that affect the thinking of this body and the people of our country. To say that anything that was said in Lindbergh's speech could fairly have that construction put on it is beyond me.

So I just want to express this thought: That while we are waiting for the other body perhaps we can give some thought and consideration to the matter that is now before the Dies committee. In other words, that we put our own house in order; that we can remove from this country those who are here in an effort to undermine our Republic, to spread nazi-ism and communism; and if we would direct our efforts to that there would not be any time wasted and we would be very busy Members of the House between now and the time the bill comes from the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Why do not those of you who oppose repeal of the embargo, in order to be consistent, insist on the embargoing of all goods that may be considered contraband?

Mr. MILLER. If the gentleman was here during the last hour he will remember that I said definitely that I certainly did favor that.

Speaking of embargoes, many of us seem to have forgotten that we have an embargo on helium gas, but I hear no agitation to withdraw it because that would help another side from the side many proponents of repeal want to help.

I thank the Members of the House for their attention. As I said, I had no words of wisdom, but if I have created a little thought and discussion it has been worth while. I know I have enjoyed these informal discussions very much this past week, and I hope they may continue. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WAR AND THE RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain tables to which I refer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the country, and particularly the House of Representatives, has become so absorbed, so excited, about the war now raging in Europe that I fear we are forgetting some of the important things relating to our country here at home. We have some very serious domestic problems, and much as we may be interested in the question of neutrality, we must not forget those large groups in this country which, perhaps, are suffering great injury at the present time.

While the debates in the Senate concerning the embargo are attracting national attention, a situation has come about of which the administration must be cognizant, and which threatens the gravest damage to American agriculture and American manufacturing.

Unobserved, undetected, amid the excitement of the conflict abroad and the discussion of the proposal to repeal the embargo, this situation concerning the trade treaties has not only come about but has practically reversed, in our trade with several countries, the position of the United States—to the grave detriment of agriculture and manufacturing interests.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, believe it is of exceeding importance to expose this situation to the gaze of the country at this time. It has already come to my attention that industrial leaders are much alarmed over this and are endeavoring to set up machinery to protect them from day to day against impending disaster. Unfortunately, the farmers of this country have no means of setting up such instrumentalities to protect themselves. The Congress of the United States is their only hope. Are we going to neglect them? Are we going to abandon them to the ravages of foreign competition?

I want the Members who are interested in this farm problem to give thought and attention to this. I must admit that these things had not occurred to me until a few days ago, but I know how the dairymen in northern New York and other parts of the United States are suffering these days; I know how hard they are pinched; I know that our farm markets are being invaded, and there must be some reason why this is so at this special time.

The major effects of any war are felt by the belligerent nations. There are, however, serious repercussions which materially affect the trade and commerce of neutral nations. New forces are brought into play which make it necessary for every country to examine its trade policy in light of changed conditions, and trade conditions are changing with lightning rapidity.

For 5 years the United States has been operating under the reciprocal trade agreements program. This program was designed to increase our foreign trade by reducing American import duties in return for which foreign countries reduced duties on goods from the United States. These treaties were concluded in peacetime and assumed a continuation of normal trade and economic activity in the world. Even in normal times the agreements have proved a real hardship to many American producers. Since hostilities began, new elements have entered the picture which should provide additional hardships to domestic producers.

By far the most important immediate effect of the war is the depreciation of foreign currencies in relation to the American dollar. Thus it will be noted that from November 19, 1938, to September 15, 1939, less than a year, the British pound declined 21.1 percent in relation to the dollar; the French franc declined 66.8 percent from May 9, 1936, to September 15, 1939, in relation to the dollar; and the Canadian dollar declined 9.7 percent from November 19, 1938, to September 15, 1939, to mention only a few examples.

The following table shows all the European countries with which agreements have been concluded, and Canada; the date of signing the agreements; the average weekly exchange quotation most closely approximating the date of signing; the exchange quotation as of September 15, 1939; and the percentage change between the two periods:

[In dollars]

Country	Date agreement signed	Average weekly exchange quotation	Exchange quotation on Sept. 15, 1939	Percent change
Belgium.....	Feb. 27, 1935	0.2350 (Feb. 23, 1935)	0.1706	-27.4
Sweden.....	May 25, 1935	.2563 (May 25, 1935)	.2382	-7.1
Netherlands.....	Dec. 20, 1935	.6790 (Dec. 21, 1935)	.5316	-21.7
Switzerland.....	Jan. 9, 1936	.3278 (Jan. 11, 1936)	.2263	-31.0
France.....	May 6, 1936	.0658 ³ / ₄ (May 9, 1936)	.0219	-66.8
Finland.....	May 18, 1936	.0220 (May 16, 1936)	.0203	-7.7
United Kingdom.....	Nov. 17, 1938	4.72 ¹ / ₂ (Nov. 19, 1938)	3.73	-21.1
Canada.....	do.....	.9921 (Nov. 19, 1938)	.8962	-9.7

Source: The Annalist, annual numbers for 1936, 1937, and 1938; the New York Times, Sept. 16, 1939.

Depreciation of one country's currency in relation to another imposes a heavy burden on the country whose currency remains at the old level. The effect is two edged. In the first place, it raises the price of American goods to foreign buyers in terms of their own money. As an example, if an article costs \$5 in American money, English merchants formerly were able to obtain it for approximately £1. Today the same article would cost approximately £1¹/₂, a 20-percent increase in price. Not only should this mean a decline in demand for American goods but also a large diversion of trade from the United States to other countries which compete for the British market in the same goods. As an example, prior to the British-American agreement, Canadian lumber enjoyed a 10-percent preference in the British market. Under the terms of the agreement, this preference was reduced to 4¹/₂ percent. Even under this rate, American lumber producers had real difficulty competing with Canada. Today, however, Canada's preference is greater than at any time. The Canadian dollar has depreciated 9.7 percent in relation to the American dollar. Add to this the preference of 4¹/₂ percent and Canada has what amounts to a preference of over 14 percent.

The second and most important effect of trading with countries having depreciated currencies is the new ease with which they can sell to us. Depreciation of one currency in relation to another has the effect of reducing the price of articles imported in terms of United States dollars, or, expressed in another way, of reducing the tariff on the articles. As an example, if an article cost £1 in England, American importers had to pay \$4.72 for it at the time of signing the agreement. Today, however, this article costs but \$3.73. Carrying the example further, if the duty on the article is 10 percent ad valorem, the total cost of the article to the American importer at the time of signing the agreement would have been \$5.19. Today this same article, after payment of duty, costs but \$4.10, 62 cents less than it would have cost had the article been duty free a year ago. Thus we are actually subsidizing imports of goods which we produce.

There is a partial remedy for this situation. In all the agreements concluded with the European countries and Canada, provision is made for termination of the agreement if at any time variations should occur in exchange rates which either Government considers so substantial as to prejudice its industries or commerce. This is, of course, a discretionary provision as Congress set no limits of variation. It would seem, however, that variations of 7 to 67 percent would eliminate all exercise of discretion and make negotiation mandatory.

It will be said by many that, though depreciation would impose hardships on American producers in normal times, in times of war belligerents are too busy supplying their own needs and neutrals are supplementing belligerent needs rather than trading with other neutrals. Experience in the World War, however, does not bear this out. From 1913 to 1919, United States dutiable imports increased 46.1 percent. Dutiable crude foodstuffs, however, increased 101.9 percent and dutiable manufactured foodstuffs increased 165.2 percent. Over this same period dutiable finished manufactures declined 18.8 percent.

Total imports of dutiable goods and imports of selected dutiable economic groups, 1913 and 1919

	1913	1919	Percent change
Total.....	\$825,484,000	\$1,205,662,000	+46.1
Crude foods, etc.....	31,917,000	64,444,000	+101.9
Manufactured foods.....	183,354,000	488,304,000	+165.2
Finished manufactures.....	311,067,000	252,602,000	-18.8
All other dutiable imports.....	299,156,000	402,312,000	+34.5

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States.

This adequately indicates the conduct of belligerents during war. Crude materials and foodstuffs require little manpower and are thus used to build up foreign exchange with which to buy finished manufactures, which require many men and heavy plant investment. The heaviest part of the burden, therefore, will probably be borne by the farmer. Canada, possessed of valuable tariff concessions and a depreciated

currency, may well flood this country with agricultural products in sufficient volume to break our prices.

In conclusion, a program which permits goods from countries which have depreciated currencies to enter the United States at duties which in many cases have been reduced 50 percent is diametrically opposed to the best interests of American agriculture and industry, and the State Department should avail itself of the privilege of negotiation or repeal of the various agreements looking toward fairer treatment of American producers.

Mr. Speaker, unless the administration moves forthwith to terminate the affected treaties, then the only hope of American agriculture is for the Congress to refuse to renew this policy when the act expires in June 1940.

If it were not for the fact that this special session will consider no subject other than neutrality, I would introduce a resolution calling upon the administration to exercise the right to terminate the treaties in accordance with their provisions for the protection of our domestic interests.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As a matter of fact, we know about as well as we know anything that the State Department—and the administration, too, for that matter—is going to march straight ahead in the consummation of these trade agreements. Taking the gentleman's presentation here, which I think is an outstanding one, we find the following situation: Our State Department this very day is holding hearings on the Argentine trade proposal. In the August 23 announcement, Under Secretary of State Welles said that he feels that the consummation of that trade agreement will be one of the outstanding accomplishments of this administration in the field of international relations. He takes the position that this is the opportune moment in which to consummate the agreement. He takes the position that it will accelerate and better perfect the good-neighbor policy. The Secretary also takes the position that the trade agreement is necessary in order for us to regain trade which was taken away from us at our expense by "certain European countries," as he designates them. When we get into the inside of the proposition, however, it appears that England went to Argentina and said: "We propose to invest hundreds of millions and perhaps one or two billions of dollars in your territory; we are your largest customer; we take the greatest percentage of your total exports; we, therefore, want you to allocate certain amounts of your exchange, which is created by our investment and our buying of your goods, for the purchase of English-made goods."

I now want to submit this question to the gentleman from New York: If England is to ship manufactured goods to Argentina as best she can under the circumstances, if England is to continue investing great sums of pounds sterling in Argentina, as she has done heretofore, on what ground can the State Department hope to recover the trade of Argentina in our favor as against its going to Britain, when we are not in position and when it is not our policy to make similar investments in Argentina, when it is not our policy to purchase from Argentina the foodstuffs and the raw agricultural products which England necessarily must have; in other words, is there not a fallacy in the State Department's proposal to put into operation trade agreements at this time which brings in only agricultural products to compete with the American farmer? Will the gentleman comment on that?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Michigan. Any time a person takes the floor here and states his honest opinion in regard to the effect of trade agreements, there is a certain group here that feels he is talking politics. I am interested in the farmers of the country. I represent a farm district and I know they are

the backbone of the country. I also know their market is being taken away from them and laudable as the idea may be on the part of the men down there in the office of the Secretary of State, who think they are going to placate these people in South America, that they are going to create a greater trade and finer international relations, that may be true, but just so long, of course, as we will furnish the money, just so long as we will lend them money, and just so long as we will give them our hide and our soul they will smile and applaud us. Let me give you one thought in this 1 minute, and this is a rule you can put down as absolutely sound. The buyers of the world are going to buy where they can buy the cheapest, where there is the lowest cost of production.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] may be permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Does the gentleman think that returning to the high protective tariff of 1930 will restore trade relations to what they were in 1929, or would that follow the action that took place after the 1930 tariff?

Mr. REED of New York. As I stated, just the minute you talk about a trade agreement, or the tariff itself, of course, you immediately get into a political discussion. If you are really and truly interested in the welfare of your country and dismiss politics, you must then admit that we have the best cash market in the world. There is only one answer. If you are going to keep that market for your people, you have to protect it. If you open it wide to the rest of the world, you are going to injure the farmers of this country.

Mr. HARE. We tried that in 1930, I think.

Mr. REED of New York. I want to say one thing more in regard to the question of buying. It so happens that away back in December of 1917 I sat in a group of men who were interested in conducting the war in England. It was a round-table discussion. It was a luncheon. I happened to sit next to the man who did all of the buying of the food for the British Empire during the war. He told me with great enthusiasm that they had contracted for all the beef they would need from South America for 4 years of war. Why were they doing that? Because they could get a better bargain. They will do it with everything else they may need. They will go into the market where they can buy the cheapest. We must not import foodstuffs to the detriment of our own farmers. The only ones who made anything out of the last war prices to speak of at all were the speculators. The farmers did not get a high price for their wheat. The speculators had contracted for it at a low price. They extended their acreage, just as your own President said at Chautauqua last year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is that agreeable to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK], who has time to address the House?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes. Let him talk as long as the Members will listen to him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] for his courtesy.

I want to back up what the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] said in his speech just now concluded. There are several Members here who were present yesterday at the

hearings before the Committee for Reciprocity Information. The Senator from Texas made the statement at that time that had he known what he knows today he would never have voted for an extension of the right given to the administration to enter into trade agreements. He further stated he regrets today his vote upon that issue.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction, my personal opinion, that the proposed Argentine trade agreement is one of the most serious questions facing the Nation today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk, and at the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered, my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday of next week, after the reading of the Journal and following any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ALLEN] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] is recognized for 25 minutes.

NEUTRALITY

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, my reason for getting this time today is to discuss with you the subject we all have on our minds, the subject the whole country is talking over at this time, neutrality. Everybody is thinking about it. What the people of the country want is a workable neutrality, not merely a theoretical neutrality.

The Europe of today is suffering a relapse into the Europe of yesterday. The lion and the unicorn are at it again. They have been at it repeatedly for several thousand years and are at it again. It is a temptation to us to say, "What will happen to us if the lion wins or if the unicorn wins?" and then start trimming our sails with an eye to this or that result; but I suppose to be 100-percent neutral we should have to deny ourselves of even this privilege.

The country we live in and the people for whom we are voice and vote here today have convinced us of one thing, that they do not wish to get into any war, so the question up to us is simply this: How are we going to handle this matter? How may we conduct our business so that we stand the slightest chance of getting into the war? How should we as Representatives of this Nation behave ourselves? How may we best recognize peril and avoid its consequences? These are merely different ways of stating this one question. America is anxious for peace and is willing to behave itself so that it may hold onto peace, but that may be a great deal more easily said than done.

Our imagination is moved as we see the peoples of Europe dancing around the spluttering powder keg as we witness the ceaseless conflict, the confusion of purpose, strange echoes of controversies that ought to have been long forgotten, leaders willing to see a world on fire rather than give up a point, the mad desires; yet all this is our own world, our own little world, the world we live in. These are our kinsmen; indeed, the folks from whom we sprang, relatives, and we must live with them and deal with them as neighbors and be thankful to high heaven the ocean is as broad as it is. We must watch for the guiding light of our star of safety and lift our hearts to the Lord of Hosts. We must seek the best peace counsel, but what is the best peace counsel? What is before us? What are the conditions of our present embargo law and how does it work? What does it purport to do and what does it actually do? Does it do what it is set up to accomplish? What is this cash-and-carry amendment so anxiously recom-

mended by the President and the Secretary of State and how will it work? Are the Senators and Congressmen, representing the people in Washington, running about, one bunch trying to do everything the President says without due consideration and another group opposing the President regardless? What is the whole picture here?

To begin with, this war does not look like any breakfast spell. It looks as if the world is in for a long, hard, heavy war—one that will take an awful toll. We in this Nation must make plans that will stand up and endure the whole siege and still hold us in peace and security, even when the noise of a warring world is thundering in our ears; all no doubt through long months and through peculiar shifts and changes that we cannot see or understand. We must watch that we do not do that which seems neutral today, but which plants seeds that will prick us tomorrow. We must consider the probable rebound and the natural reaction of every blow we strike today for peace and neutrality.

Our primary question is the proposed repeal of the arms-embargo section of the Neutrality Act. As you know, this act was adopted by Congress and became law in 1935. Then, in 1935, there was added to the law the cash-and-carry provision, inspired, I believe, by the war at that time going on in Spain.

The act then underwent an overhauling at the hands of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and then became the law of the land. The main amendment inserted in the 1937 act dealt with a certain commodity embargo; indeed, it was a cash-and-carry provision. Remember, this was in 1937. This provision prevented any shipment of general supplies and commodities under our flag on any vessel of ours to any nation at war.

Unfortunately, however, when passed, this cash-and-carry provision was placed on only a 2-year basis, and, again unfortunately, it expired on May 31 of this year. Then was when our present law took on its present status. Very many persons who have written and wired their Congressmen and who are still doing so do not seem to know this, a fact often revealed by their communications. So I am afraid that Mr. FISH's specially built committee overlooked the active emphasis on this point. The group hatched up here by Mr. FISH; that is, under the special Fish hatchery, has perhaps not covered the entire ground. Of course, there is a lot of ground to cover; it encircles the globe.

The neutrality law as it now stands allows any and all of the makings of munitions of war to be shipped to any or all fighting countries right today, on our vessels, manned by our seamen, under our flag, and that is now being done every hour. The cash-and-carry plan would not allow this. It would not permit anything to be shipped to a warring country.

As you know, the bill under consideration is House Joint Resolution 306.

Here is exactly how that part of it reads. This is section 2 (a) of the cash-and-carry plan:

It shall thereafter be unlawful for any American vessel to carry any passengers or any articles or materials to any state named in such proclamation.

Then section 1 (a) provides that upon a proclamation of the President or the Congress by concurrent resolution declaring a state of war to be in existence, the cash-and-carry proposal is to be levied against any nation involved.

They not only can, but now are, doing a tremendous traffic on the seas. This is one hundredfold more dangerous than the cash-and-carry plan that is proposed. Let us suppose something happens that is most likely to happen. I know we are not convinced by one of these remote things that may happen, but let us take as an analogy a thing that not only can happen, but is most likely to happen. Suppose under the embargo as it stands, a shipment is going from America to the heart of Europe, which is being done now in our ships, and suppose when it gets out it may have on it mercuriochrome, iodine, or other medicines, or it may have foodstuffs, or may have the makings of the high explosives that are instruments of death, for that matter. As a matter of fact,

as far as the facts are concerned, one may now put on one vessel everything required to make the most deadly instrumentality of war, just so you put one thing in one part of the vessel and one thing in another; and you know the nations of Europe are not going to order from us, in the first place, if they have the makings in their own nation.

So that is the trouble with an embargo. Embargo legislation was entered into in good faith by Thomas Jefferson. He espoused the cause, and it was begun as a partial embargo and in developing the theory they made it a long embargo, and you remember they called it the "O grab me law," and New England threatened to secede from the Union before it was over. That was one flag of Thomas Jefferson that did trail in the dust, and in the very last months of his administration he worked hard to wipe that blot, as far as he could, from the escutcheon of his administration.

So when we analyze it, the embargoes are not so good.

Now, take the example. What would happen? If a vessel got out on the high seas, beyond the 3-mile limit, manned by American boys, floating the American flag, and it was scuttled and sent to the bottom, what would be the reaction here? Warlike, indeed. We would wail that the American flag had gone under the waters. Streamer headlines would be in all our papers and in our motion picture shows, and in a little while with two or three affairs like that happening we know what the result would be—war.

Then take the cash-and-carry plan and let the same thing happen, even though it were a loaded cannon or assembled armored planes or motortrucks, and the vessel should get beyond the 3-mile limit only to be mined or torpedoed and blown up on the high seas. What would be the reaction here—warlike? No, indeed. No; our ship would not be sunk, our boys would not be drowned, our flag would not be sent beneath the waters. We would have the money, and it would not be our vessel and, therefore, there would be no reaction of consequence.

This is the reason, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the President said that this is the peaceful way, and I ask you what sense there is to a theory that, with over 10,000,000 people now out of work here, we shall hold to a law that results in having things done in Europe and Canada and other places that would ordinarily come here where the manufacturing should naturally be done? What is the difference, in the last analysis?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes, I yield to the able Congressman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I am interested to know if the gentleman contends that the arms embargo provision of our present law is in itself unneutral and, if so, why? And what is the gentleman's opinion as to the reason for this urgency for the repeal of that provision of the law, and entering upon the sale of our war materials?

Mr. PATRICK. I shall gladly answer that.

Mr. COX. In other words, if the gentleman will permit me to amplify the question, is the matter we are now considering, in the opinion of the gentleman, really in the interest of peace, or is it an effort to obtain business, and to express a sympathy for England and France at the risk of the peace and security of this Nation?

Mr. PATRICK. The repeal of the present embargo and the enactment of the cash-and-carry plan that will let us sell our own stuff, and sell it at our own door, is, in my opinion, more free from any element of intervention than any other course open to us; and when it comes to a practical application of it, it is less hypocritical than any other system that has been advanced, and is directed more logically and consistently toward peace than anything else advanced.

Mr. COX. Are we attempting to promote peace or advance the needs of business?

Mr. PATRICK. We are endeavoring to advance the cause of peace; but, incidentally, since this comes up, and does no harm—and it may be that it is not wise psychologically to discuss it—business can be taken care of and peace advanced at the same time. But in the event that that does not follow, I would strike out the business bid first.

Mr. COX. How are we advancing the cause of peace when we associate ourselves with one of the belligerents? In other words—

Mr. PATRICK. Oh, all right; the gentleman has asked enough. The gentleman from Georgia has asked as much as I am able to answer now, and perhaps more. I do say this: That whenever we inaugurate a cash-and-carry plan we are then doing only the natural thing. We cannot be concerned, if we are sincerely neutral.

Mr. COX rose.

Mr. PATRICK. Oh, do not butt in, please, at least in the midst of a sentence. The gentleman used to be a school teacher, and I am sure he understands what I am driving at. Whenever the cash-and-carry plan is being employed, and whenever we are making our own stuff and selling it here to whoever comes and buys, we are only carrying out a natural thing, because then we are saying to whoever may come here that we are not responsible for whoever has the advantage on the high seas today. We do not know who may succeed next month and get the advantage, and we should not concern ourselves with that, if we are sincerely trying to pass a neutral law. We cannot legislate by the measure of conditions in Europe. Besides, we could not possibly, and should not wish to, have anything to do with that; and so if we are going to do a sincerely neutral thing, we should do it in looking after our own affairs. We do not want to drive business into Europe or into Canada that will stay there and injure our business here after peace is restored.

Mr. COX. The gentleman speaks of the cash and carry. Would the gentleman have us abandon the doctrine of freedom of the seas, to which we have always adhered? In other words, must we, in the interest of maintaining a strict neutrality, altogether abandon that doctrine?

Mr. PATRICK. No; that merely means that we could go out there, we have a right to go out there, but we do not wish to go out there and have our heads knocked off.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes.

Mr. HARE. Referring to the pertinent inquiry of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] as to whether or not this contemplated action is for the purpose of increasing business or an effort for peace, does not the gentleman feel that in view of the circumstances now existing under the existing Neutrality Act, from the standpoint of business, it would materially decrease more under the proposed plan than under the existing plan?

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman means that we would have less neutrality?

Mr. HARE. No; I mean that we would have less business under the proposed plan than under the existing plan; and therefore it could not be, and it is not primarily, increased business.

Mr. PATRICK. Of course I think the gentleman is right. It will hurt our merchant marine, but we cannot help it. We are doing this to promote peace.

Mr. COX. I appreciate the gentleman's feelings, and I am sure that I indulge the same feeling toward the belligerents. I have great sympathy for England and France. As an individual I am free to express that, but as a Member of Congress representing the people I have to be very careful in expressing it in the blood of somebody else's boy or in the blood of the young men of this country.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I shall yield to the big chief from Wisconsin in a minute. The reason I am opposed to the present embargo is because, in the last analysis, it is only an innocuous gesture.

It is like putting a fence around the front yard but none around the back yard. It makes a pretense, it seems to me. It is like the baseball manager who took his boy along and pitched him every game that came along. They said to him, "Why on earth do you keep pitching Potsby Botts? He hasn't got a thing on the ball." The manager said, "I know it, but he has such a lovely wind-up." [Laughter.] So that is the way with the embargo.

Mr. COX. I am in accord with the gentleman's views about the law. I think it was a very foolish act for the Congress to have adopted, and I think it ought to be repealed, but I am worried about repealing it now, you understand.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman from Georgia knows it only went into effect the first of May. We had cash and carry for 2 years up until then. Germany came here and bought stuff for those 2 years and before, and laid it in well. Now, would it be unneutral for the United States to say to the nations who do not want to fight, the nations who wanted peace and who did not buy ammunition during that time, when we have lined the larder of the other people, now when the time comes when they want to buy something from us we say, "We will not sell it." Is that not unneutral in itself? Is not that unfair? Would that not be an unwholesome and unbalanced method of doing business?

Mr. COX. I agree that we can take the position that what we are now doing is continuing a question that we initiated when there was no war in Europe as between the present contending parties.

Mr. PATRICK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. On the question that is frequently raised, that repeal of the embargo now, after war has started, might be unneutral for the reason that it will hurt Germany, let me suggest that if that be true, then the converse of that proposition is true, that we could not change our law or invoke cash and carry because that would be hurtful to the other countries. In other words, that doctrine means that after war breaks out we are handcuffed, and we cannot change our neutrality law because it might help somebody.

Mr. PATRICK. Exactly.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. It is our domestic law and we can change it any time we want to.

Mr. PATRICK. That is correct. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COX. And we should make our own welfare our first concern and legislate without regard.

Mr. PATRICK. Yes. Thank you very kindly. How true that is. How vital that is, not only now, but as a precedent on subsequent legislation, that we attend our own spinning, and that we learn to pass laws for ourselves. If we try to cut our garment to the changing winds of an ever-changing map of Europe, and if we pass laws or withhold laws because of some condition that arises in that peculiarly miasmic place they call Europe, we will always be having the running fits; we will always be with the blind staggers in this Nation. So we cannot afford to attempt that sort of measure. It seems only folly when it is said that because this was the law a few days ago we should not change it. Suppose this is the beginning of a hundred years' war. They had one once. Would we have to be stymied and tied here with our eyes bulging and not even able to do business on a businesslike basis? It is not the American way. It never will be the American way. We can be neutral. We can do what we want to, and yet be ourselves and have an independence that is our own and stand on our own feet and fight our own battles. Who says that we cannot make and sell our own stuff at our own front door, in our own land, our own products to our own buyers? Sell them to whoever may come, from whatever source, as long as they put the money on the barrel head and take it home themselves and do not involve us. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman then maintains a position that it is not essential to repeal the existing arms embargo of our Neutrality Act in order to remain neutral or in the interest of peace?

Mr. PATRICK. I think the most peaceful and neutral thing we could do would be to repeal the Embargo Act.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In what respect?

Mr. PATRICK. It is like the Shakespearian character, Honest Iago. It does not hold to the very virtue that it announces itself most highly to proclaim.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an answer to that question?

Mr. PATRICK. Gladly, to the distinguished Texan.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. With reference to the reason why the repeal of the embargo may be helpful to our own basis, the gentleman well knows that the only two times an embargo has been invoked were in the Italo-Ethiopian War and in the Spanish Civil War. Representatives of the State Department testified before our committee on the hearing on this bill that it was exceedingly difficult to enforce that law because the law provided that shipments could not be made to neutral nations for reshipment to belligerent nations, and it was practically impossible to determine when the shipments were to be reshipped.

If that be true of the minor wars, how much more so is it true in the war that is now going on? In the enforcement of any embargo it would be charged that we were unneutral because we might permit it as to some but not as to others, and the injured country would say, "You permit it in the case of the other country but not in our case."

Mr. PATRICK. I thank the gentleman. I am in favor of clearing up some of this difficulty. The situation just becomes more involved and complex, so much so that the end is not in sight; we cannot see where the measure stops. You can see the difficult position into which we are getting. Why can we not do the open thing, the sincere thing, the businesslike thing, and yet the intelligent thing, the thing that is more peaceful? It seems such folly for us to attempt to do something that will not stand the test of analysis. That is the only foundation worth standing on. Those who believe in superficial logic will walk up to a Senator or Congressman and say: "Well, Larry, how do you stand on this keeping us out of war?"

"Well," says the Senator or the Congressman, "I am for an embargo against selling high explosives or implements of war to a warring country." And the superficial, light-hearted man goes whistling down the street, without analyzing it, and says: "Well, good old Larry is trying his best to keep us out of war." I honestly believe that is all that has held up the antirepeal forces thus far.

I walked over to the Senate line last Friday afternoon with those going to hear the debate, and talked to more than 20 men. One was from Michigan, two were from Texas—a number of States were represented. I was amazed at their replies. I asked if they knew one another, for I thought there must be an agreement among them. They were strangers to each other. Out of the whole 23 or 24 I found only 4 men who were not wholeheartedly in favor of repeal of the embargo and enactment of the cash-and-carry plan.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If Hitler's government, if Moscow and Japan brought money here and laid it on the barrel head, would the gentleman be in favor of selling them arms, munitions, implements of war, and war supplies to carry away?

Mr. PATRICK. The word "everybody" means just what it says.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman would be willing to sell to them, would he?

Mr. PATRICK. Is the gentleman serious in his question?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Yes; I am very serious. If Moscow, Germany, and Japan want to purchase arms, munitions, or implements of war, and war supplies and came here and laid cash on the barrel head, would the gentleman sell to these countries.

Mr. PATRICK. The gentleman is using "Moscow" figuratively, meaning the Soviet Union?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Yes; I mean the Soviet Union, which is now engaged in war.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I have not gotten the gentleman's full question yet.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Under the gentleman's proposal of selling arms, munitions of war, war supplies, and implements of war with the only restriction that cash must be laid on the barrel head, would the gentleman be in favor of selling them to the Soviet Union, Germany, and Japan?

Mr. PATRICK. Certainly; if they wanted to buy and carry them away.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. They would have to carry them away themselves.

Mr. PATRICK. Yes; certainly. Neutrality is neutrality.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I must yield first to the gentleman from Texas.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUTH. Is it not a fact that the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin answered itself?

Mr. PATRICK. I think so.

Mr. SOUTH. The gentleman from Alabama or any other Member of Congress would not have the right to say which nation would be hurt. When the law is passed it will speak for itself and will be equally enforced as between the several nations. The thing we are trying to get away from now is an effort to discriminate as between various nations. Certainly if the law is repealed it will be lawful to sell to any and all nations. The nations named by the gentleman can buy on the same terms and under the same conditions as any other nation. Is not that true?

Mr. PATRICK. To be sure, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman is making a splendid address. I think it is very enlightening. In connection with statements that have been made, is it not a fact that during the last 4 or 5 years the German Government and other warring powers have bought from us great quantities of steel and iron, the very things they need in war, and are now using it against the democracies and against civilization? For the last 4 years this iron and steel has been taken right out of New York Harbor to Germany to be used in this war for which they were then preparing.

Mr. PATRICK. We knew it, for did we not see the war clouds rising all the time?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Certainly.

Mr. PATRICK. And now since we sold to them all the while and knowing they were preparing for war—and also to Japan—are we now to deny the same materials to the nations which tried to be peaceful?

We cannot now shut our gates in the faces of friends, but to keep them open to our friends we must keep them open to all, and that is exactly the position we want to take. Not to do so would be to do an unneutral act and at the same time would be doing exactly what was done when Jefferson was President of the United States; that is, throttling our own industry and putting an "Oh, grab me" sign on America and its business.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER. Will not the gentleman admit that in the last 4 years or the last 7 years we have sold more munitions, more steel, and more scrap iron to the so-called Allies than we have to the Hitler-Russian Government?

Mr. PATRICK. What difference does that make? We are neutral, are we not?

Mr. MILLER. Then answer this question: Is it any more neutral to sell to all nations than it is to refuse to sell to any nation?

Mr. PATRICK. I do not know what the gentleman has in mind. Some nations are at war, while some are not.

Mr. MILLER. I meant to nations at war.

Mr. PATRICK. No.

Mr. MILLER. Why not leave the act as it is? It is neutral.

Mr. PATRICK. Because we are thinking for ourselves. I answered that, if the gentleman will observe. We have sold all these years to the aggressor nations that have already feathered their nests. Now come the nations who hoped for peace and did not feather their nests—and what are we going to do? Are we to supply the belligerent nations and deny supplies to the nations that are naturally peaceful?

Mr. MILLER. Does not the gentleman honestly believe that the so-called Allies have been just as busily arming during all these years as the so-called aggressor nations?

Mr. PATRICK. I do not believe that; no.

Mr. MILLER. They have told us they could not pay their war debts on that account.

Mr. PATRICK. But we have their money over here.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Can the gentleman tell me if he has heard any explanation given by those who oppose repeal of the arms embargo with reference to what reason there should be for not treating arms, ammunition, and implements of war like we do other commodities that are branded as contraband; if they are all subject to search and seizure, why not treat them all alike?

Mr. PATRICK. I would like to have some gentleman who wishes to support the embargo spend about 20 minutes on that subject. I am sure it would take at least 20 minutes for him to develop it.

Mr. SOUTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SOUTH. Further commenting on the question raised by the gentleman from Ohio, is it not true that we would appear at least to be more unneutral, and I think would be less neutral, if we would undertake to retain embargo in that it will certainly put this country in a class by itself with reference to other major world powers and any time we adopt a policy that is contrary to the policy adopted by other major world powers do we not immediately become a target at which the several different nations in the world will shoot? And might that not within itself probably involve us in difficulties?

Mr. PATRICK. I think so. However, I am not well enough acquainted with the embargo acts of other nations to discuss them as one well versed upon that subject.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of any previous orders heretofore entered, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to insert certain extracts from a report on the American German youth movement in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes in addition to the 5 already allotted me. In other words, I would like to speak for 8 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to make certain observations with reference to matters having to do with the interests of America, and what I may say is not

to be treated as a criticism of a certain investigation of un-American activities. In these times we should not criticize, but should try to constructively advise, even a committee of Congress, regarding certain things that should be done and should not be done. In this spirit I stand here today to say that there have been certain matters appearing in the headlines of the press which I think go beyond the jurisdiction of the resolution providing for the committee to investigate un-American activities.

May I call attention to the fact that the committee allowed a witness to testify with respect to what happened in Russia 10 or 15 years ago. This witness was a man by the name of Krivitsky, who, in my own opinion, is nothing but a "phony." He is an alien in this country. He is here to sell his wares. He prepared these articles for certain publishers; if the facts are not correct, the articles are libelous under our laws. In order to protect the publishers involved as well as himself, Krivitsky gave testimony before a congressional committee, which would give the articles immunity under the Constitution.

There was another witness—a criminal who admits he served in prison—who took the stand. He claims to have been a Communist; and I want to state most emphatically at this point that I have no use for communism or any other foreign "ism," nor would I attempt to protest any lawful exposure of their subversive activities. On the contrary, I would be glad to help. This man stated that the Communist Party 13 years ago borrowed \$1,700,000 from a man by the name of Rothstein, a gambler, to fight labor troubles in New York City. The committee allowed that witness to besmirch the police department of my city, the police commissioner, and indirectly the mayor, because this ex-convict stated the \$1,700,000 was borrowed from this gambler to buy police protection and to finance the strike. It is highly questionable, and no proof thereof was obtained by the committee that a gambler of Mr. Rothstein's reputation should lend any money to anyone except members of his own gang or clique. But, assuming that to be true, what evidence was there presented of the bribe to police of the city of New York? Why should civil servants be exposed to serious charges of bribery without definite evidence to prove their guilt?

Mr. Speaker, the police department of the city of New York is composed of almost 24,000 men, who are the finest type of police officers and the finest type of Americans you have ever come in contact with; and that goes for a fine mayor and a fine police commissioner. It is unfair, and the committee should not have allowed such evidence to go into the record, unless it had actual proof of this corruption. This matter was investigated 13 years ago by the city of New York, and no corruption was found, and there was no proof that any money was loaned by Rothstein or anybody else. This testimony besmirched the police department of the city of New York, and there is no way for the city of New York or the 24,000 police officers, who are trying to do their duty, to defend themselves from accusations before a congressional committee.

What is important to me, Mr. Speaker, is to protect our own United States. Why does not the Dies committee or some other committee give us some real facts—not about what happened in Russia 13 years ago, or whether 400,000 or 500,000 persons were purged, as Krivitsky said? We are not a bit concerned about that. We are concerned with our democratic principles here in the United States.

What is going on today? What are the Communists doing today that in any way affects our people and our form of government? What are the Nazis doing today, and what are all "isms" doing today, and what can we do to eradicate these evils?

Let me repeat that I have the greatest fondness for the members of this committee and its chairman. As I said in my opening remarks, I have no criticism to make against them. I think they are trying honestly to do a good job, and they have given us much light on subversive activities. I am making this observation for the purpose of helping the committee. Why do they not go into the question of alien youth movements in this country? There are at least 50,000 chil-

dren between the ages of 4 and 14 who are members of an organization under the leadership of Fritz Kuhn—an organization which implants in their hearts the idea that the Nazi government of Hitler is the best government for them, and that they must follow the teachings and the principles of this so-called government.

If the investigators of the committee were investigating this youth movement, they would find a communication by Fritz Kuhn, which I shall place in the Record, in which he addresses this youth movement. As I said a moment ago, there are at least 50,000 children in this organization, and some of them refuse to salute our flag. In their hearts is imbedded the spirit of "Heil Hitler" and of war. If the committee would take the trouble to investigate, they would find that some time in June 1939 Mr. Kuhn, who claims he is the leader not only of the German Bund in this country but also of the American-German Youth Movement, addressed a communication to the members of that movement. I have a copy of it here and you will read it in the Record. In this communication he tells them to carry on in the same philosophy and under the same principles as the Nazi government, and to do what Mr. Hitler tells them to do. I shall also place in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks information about certain activities of the girls' youth movement. There are at least 25,000 girls in this country who are having instilled in them the spirit of hate and intolerance by the so-called Nazi Bund under the leadership of Mr. Fritz Kuhn. These are the problems we should investigate and these are the conditions we want to eradicate in this country. These are the facts the Congress and the people of this country would like to know. We are not concerned with anything else but America. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the documents to which I referred a moment ago are as follows:

[From Ten Years German Youth in U. S. A.]

(Editorial)

DEDICATED TO OUR YOUTH AT THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN GERMAN YOUTH MOVEMENT

In the comparatively short period, 10 years, a proud and zealous movement has been built up, thanks to the cooperation of the fore-runners of the German Youth in America and its friends and patrons. All those who prophesied defeat not believing on the preservation of our folkdom to last for times thereafter were greatly mistaken. Numerous Youth camps have been made possible without greater funds. German schools have been erected by dozens of cities, where the adherents of old times had long ago given up the fight for preservation of our folkdom.

All these accomplishments mean, of course, only a start, a small beginning, but the hitting success within such a short time does prove that the spirit which has been planted by Adolf Hitler into the heart and mind of the German people in the homeland, will be well able to bring about a unit of world opinion and a renewing of the will to live of the American Germandom.

The entire, great, healthy kernel of this German-American can be easily comprehended. This beginning will be for you, you boys and girls of German origin in America. Some day you will take over the work to continue the construction.

To your day of honor 1939. Sieg-heil. Free America.

Fritz Kuhn, Bund Leader.

[From Ten Years German Youth in U. S. A.]

FIVE YEARS OF GIRLS' DIVISIONS IN UNITED STATES

It was 4 years on January 12 when the first call for a girls' division was sounded. Erna Dinkelacker and Tilde Richter called the girls to a meeting. The new movement grew fast.

Erna Dinkelacker took over the general leadership of the girls and Erika Wagebusch became group leader.

In June 1934 they had 33 girl members present. Today the membership goes into hundreds of hundreds.

"German girl, you belong to us." This call sounds all over the country. As much as the boy belongs to an organization so does the girl. The girls here in this land are exposed to extreme superficiality. When you see these young dolls on the street smeared with powder and paint, you can't distinguish a girl of 15 or 16 years of age from one at the end of her twenties. There is nothing young about them. They look all tired out with movie manners making them disgusting to look at. A man who thinks can't visualize such a doll becoming sometime a real comrade for life and a mother of a coming generation. The influence of a folk corrupting race has already done "good work" in this country. And the American woman has already entered into this whirl of decay inasmuch as some warnings are sounded now and again, but these voices are too weak.

But the voice of the youth division has saved many girls. We often saw them come to us with painted fingernails and lips but after some home meetings the warlike paint was vanished.

But not only the painting vanished. There is a difference in the stride of our girls which is now sound and firm. They now come back from camps and sport places with a natural color. They don't need any more paint.

We want girls who know their task, which is to be the guardian of the old German inheritance, who are to keep German customs, German manners, and before all to faithfully keep their German blood pure.

For all that we march and are proud to know that we are helping to build up Germanism in America.

We know that nothing can hold us back. Through night and fog, carrying the black flag with the white sign of victory shining on it we march proudly and silently into the fifth year of battle, marching on toward our goal.

JANUARY 1933.

[From Ten Years German Youth in United States]

GERMAN YOUTH IN NORTH AMERICA 10 YEARS

Today is the anniversary of the day on which the foundation was laid to a youth movement by a small group of German boys. Something which seemingly appeared still impossible on March 1929 was just the thing we longed for with all our hearts, namely, the unifying of the entire youth of German origin in North America. It has been of unspeakable effort to accomplish a planned structure which at the same time had to be based on a healthy foundation. On the one hand, we lacked the means by which to accomplish anything. On the other hand, we were boys at the age of about 12 to 24, who had to create everything from within themselves, and sometimes got a headache from planning how to go about things. The manifold opposition also was not just the thing to further our growth, but perhaps at the same time was to spur us and to give us the tenacity for reaching, step by step, our great zeal.

While black, red, and gold still were the colors of Germany, the German Youth in United States bore the colors of an awakening Germanism.

[From Youth Movement Develops]

YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS

The first motion of the national force of American Germanism fell in the year 1933, and found its first expression in the new-founded bund of Friends of the New Germany. We saw in it a new mutual zeal in fighting for a unit of the entire German nationality. With this the German boys' division as a youth movement became a youth organization brought upon a broader foundation with the unification of the bund. From the boys' division until now, comprising only Greater New York, grew the youth division, which soon was to extend all over the country. Youth divisions were founded in all cities in which the bund already had local groups. Boys and girls from 8 to 18 years of age were admitted to them. This was, of course, only made possible with the help of the bund, which brought about a tremendous development of these youth divisions. While before 1933 the boys' divisions comprised more or less a selection of boys destined to become later the leaders of the youth, the youth division, therefore, could use these boys after 1933 as leaders, operating the then blooming youth division on a broader foundation.

FROM COAST TO COAST

Nineteen hundred and thirty-four was the year of development. The idea of the boys' division was brought about all over the land. In far-off cities the flag of the youth would fly. Until now groups of German boys' divisions existed only in greater New York—Manhattan and Brooklyn. The task now was to build up the boys' division in other cities too. On the first "day of youth" in April the order to attack was given. Soon after a beer truck, packed with 40 boys in uniform, instead of beer boxes, went off in the direction to Buffalo. There, in the city of Niagara Falls, Eberhard von Nasse was living, the founder and protector of the boys' division. With his help a third division could be formed.

Forty boys in a beer truck traveled 675 kilometers to Buffalo. The truck broke down several times. At last we had to send it away and we continued on foot to Buffalo. At last, after 24 hours, we reached Buffalo. A score of people were waiting for us. A hot supper for refreshment, and then into the quarters. The next evening our youth festivity took place, resulting in 20 new memberships for the boys' division. So division 3, Buffalo, was formed.

Soon after some boys of New Jersey contended to create the fourth division. A couple of boys entered into it and division 4 was founded.

On July 1934, an advancement was made to the oldest city of the American Germanism, Pennsylvania. The division 5, Philadelphia, was founded. A couple of boys of the boys' division of Brooklyn went to Philadelphia, explaining to the local group of the bund the necessity of a boys' division, found a home for it, appointed a youth leader, and went away again, leaving behind a division of 15 men. So division 5, Philadelphia, was founded.

Within a short time, in nearby Newark, N. J., a boys' division was founded. Nassau County, Long Island, followed as division 7, built up also by the nearby Brooklyn.

Even in the Middle West, the spirit of an awakening youth of German origin was being exercised. Division, Detroit, Mich., was

created, and soon after a division in Chicago, the great city of the Middle West.

So, at the end of 1934, 10 boys' divisions were founded from coast to coast, being one in will and faith, who are to lead the way for a great American-German future.

Besides those successful boys' divisions stands, already, the beginning of the girls' divisions. In the midst of a feverish soliciting of the boys, the girls' division came to life, and for the German girl in the United States an organization was created.

BOYS' DIVISION, SECTION 3—BUFFALO

Some days ago we received your first newspaper. General astonishment, especially about the closing article.

"Section 3 in Buffalo shall show what they accomplished up to the present time. What are we able to do? Well, we are not far-sighted here (perhaps you in New York are). Therefore, we couldn't report our activities until now. But it has made a tremendous impression upon us that our guardian (?) has already published a newspaper. Big Eberhard, as the mother of our company, however, told us already about the necessity of having some day our own newspaper. But, that this plan should come true so soon, that we hadn't expected of you New Yorkers.

But, you want to know of us, what we are doing here. Of course, we still are very young. Just 3 weeks ago we had you with us here, and you inspired the desire in us to work in Buffalo also, in the spirit of the boys' division. But we have accomplished already a great deal. On our last journey we have been represented by 14 men. To get 14 German boys together within 3 weeks—that means something. It proves how strong and lasting the reaction of your visit with us in Buffalo has been. To this very day we always speak of you, and wish that we already could be like you. We already dream of the summer camp where we can be with you, where we can play with you, where you can show us the genuine spirit of the boys' divisions. We look forward to the day when we will see you again. You have awakened in us a great longing by your proud German spirit, while you were with us in Buffalo. We hope to see you again soon—that is the wish of all of us.

Division 3 marches—you can be sure of that. Last Sunday we went hunting, then some games, hand ball, and so forth. Then, for the first time in this year, bathing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee). Under a previous special order, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PROPOSED TRADE AGREEMENT WITH THE ARGENTINE

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the gentleman preceding me this afternoon in regard to the problem of neutrality and also with regard to the subversive influences we must combat. Earlier in the day the gentleman from New York spoke of a still greater problem, as he thought, or one equal to these, confronting us, when he called attention to some of the trade agreements now being contemplated, and I should like to say just a few words about prospective trade agreements.

I also went yesterday to present my statement to the Committee for Reciprocity Information in connection with the proposed trade agreement with the Argentine. I find myself in somewhat of a predicament in this respect, that in general I favor trade agreements where they can be mutually profitable and beneficial, but they must be reciprocally helpful to obtain my approval. I feel that if we enter into trade agreements with industrial or semi-industrial countries, there is a chance of our reaching agreements which may be mutually helpful, since we are semi-industrial ourselves. I do not hesitate a moment to condemn a trade agreement or a proposal for such an agreement if it seems that it is bound to be harmful to any considerable portion of our people.

I wish to say in all fairness to the present study that we should remember that the committee now is really studying the various items of this proposed agreement, and we should not act on the assumption that the proposals have already been incorporated into an agreement. I hope that most of the items studied will not be included. I also wish to say, as I did yesterday to the committee, that these men have my great sympathy in their huge task on such a complicated measure. I expressed to them a profound and sincere hope that their judgment will equal their patriotic intent in their study. That is my feeling in the matter.

The reason I am particularly alarmed about this proposed trade agreement with the Argentine is that we now are contemplating making such an agreement with a great agricultural empire, we ourselves also being a great agricultural

people. The Argentine lies about as far south of the Equator as we are to the north, and, except with reverse seasons, that area has about the same climatic conditions and the same agricultural production. The agricultural products of the two countries are highly competitive.

I fear that too many of our leading experts are apt to overlook the fact that a large part of our country west of the one hundredth meridian is semiarid, and nine-tenths of it is fit agriculturally only for grazing; also that livestock, cattle, sheep, and wool production is the basic production of that area out in the far West. This is exactly what the Argentine produces, and that is what my people fear. Western cattlemen and sheepmen are struggling with their backs to a wall. Our Government has placed many restrictions lately around our western livestock industry. If we should be so unwise as to throw against them the competition of the Argentine, which God forbid, the livestock industry will vanish from our West.

Cattle and sheep have been the basis of the early economic life of Arizona, not considering now the rich mineral deposits. So what I would like this committee engaged in the study to suggest—and I shall back the policy so long as this is carried out—that we seek out those nations which produce different products from our own and which we need, with a view of so arranging lessened duties that there may be profitable trade between us. I love my neighbors, but there is a limit to the love I bear my neighbors. I am not willing to cripple any American industries, certainly not the basic industries of my State, in order to encourage trade.

I know, of course, that the committee is looking at the good of the whole country, but it cannot be for the good of the whole country to cripple the livestock industry or the mining industry or the agricultural industry of half of our people. Just as an example, in the irrigated valleys of the southern part of my State we have been growing cotton. There is a surplus of cotton. We have been trying to get away from it. Down in Yuma County, where it costs about \$120 or \$130 per acre to bring the desert into cultivation through the reclamation process, we have now turned thousands of acres to the production of flaxseed. Down there we can produce 25 bushels per acre at a cost of about \$1.08 per bushel. This compares with certain other parts of our country where 6 bushels of flaxseed are produced per acre. It was at the invitation of the Department of Agriculture that the farmers down in Yuma County, Ariz., turned their acres not to cotton, not to wheat, but to flax or alfalfa. Incidentally, I may say that one-tenth of all the alfalfa seed of this country is grown on the few tillable acres in Yuma County, Ariz., and there are not enough acres down there tilled to equal one big wheat ranch in Montana. If we should lower the duty on flaxseed or on alfalfa seed from Argentina, we would ruin these farmers and jeopardize Uncle Sam's investment in those valuable lands.

Mr. Speaker, we started in the beginning of this Republic as practically a 100-percent-agricultural people. Gradually we have become urbanized and industrialized. I do not want this Nation to be completely urbanized or industrialized. I believe that a composite mixture of economic elements give us strength. I want a variegated industry and I do not feel that we would be doing the economics of this country justice by destroying our farmer class, our stock raisers, in order to build up our industries, even though they should be built up. So in order that we may continue to be half industrial and half rural, as we have been, I prefer that the farm and the factory in this country be mutually dependent on each other, and this is a policy which I think is a wise national policy. I never want to see the day when the cities of America are dependent upon the pampas of the Argentine.

Right now, of course, we would like to cultivate a good-neighbor policy with Latin America to the south of us—yes; more particularly that part of Latin America lying near the Equator which produces, as Central America does and as Brazil does, products which we need. Yes; we have no bananas! I think I could grow them in my own back yard in

Tempe, Ariz., but I do not want to do so. I prefer that we get them from Central America. We grow no coffee. We grow no rubber, at least not from trees, although we can produce that in some parts of the Southwest. Truly we can produce rubber in Arizona, but it is not an established, pioneer industry, which we would kill by getting rubber somewhere else.

So I wish that in our reciprocal-trade agreements we could see to it that we trade that which we have for that which we want from other countries and cannot produce here.

Now, in regard to the Argentine, there is one thing that particularly strikes me very unfavorably, and that is that a great deal of American capital has gone into the Argentine. American packing concerns have gone down there and they have exported American capital to build their plants. They used cheap foreign labor, depriving our own people of those jobs, and now they want greater freedom to ship their finished products into this country. I have no sympathy with that sort of trade agreements.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Arizona be extended for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I do not know that I care for 10 minutes, unless there are questions to be asked.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. HOUSTON. What proportion of canned beef comes in from the Argentine that is used in this country today? What is the total consumption?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I am unable to answer that; I have not the figures. I understand, however, that canned Argentine beef is quite frequently found on the shelves of our storehouses.

Mr. HOUSTON. Is it not a fact that there is not enough imported here to take care of the requirement of the Marine Corps for 1 day?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. If that is true, I am glad to know it. I am unaware of the exact situation. I might say to my friend from Kansas that it is not alone the amount that is shipped in but it is the threat that forces down the price of our meat. It is true, perhaps, that we would not include fresh meat, and certainly no live animals, from the Argentine, because we fear the foot-and-mouth disease. However, if we admit the byproducts, we might do something that will in turn reflect itself in the price of meat, because it is not the meat of the animal which tells the whole story. I am reliably informed that a packing house will pay more for a live animal than it gets for the meat which that animal produces, making its profit out of the byproducts; so that if we admit the byproducts from Argentine, we might as well admit the fresh meat or the live animal, because the effect would be the same.

Mr. HOUSTON. Is it not a good deal like the woman who reached into her husband's pocket and got out his pay envelope. He got sore about it, and his wife said, "What are you sore about? There is nothing in it." The husband said, "No; but it is the principle of the thing." Is not that about all there is to this?

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. KUNKEL. I was looking at some figures which the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HORTON] had, and which showed that there were two and a half million pounds imported from Argentina into this country in June of this year, and three and a half million pounds in August of this year, and those figures do not include imports from Brazil and other South American countries, which are considerable.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. In conclusion I want to affirm my belief that trade between nations is a means of peace, and that such is one way to promote peace, but if we permit our capital to go into other countries to exploit their labor in order to make profits, that is not a means of good will, but a

very potent means of ill will. That is one thing that I wish we might take steps to prevent to the extent it is now going on. [Applause.]

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 18, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. CARTER introduced a bill (H. R. 7588) granting to the Vice President and Members of Congress the privilege of franking official correspondence not exceeding 1 ounce in weight by air mail, which was referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their resolution dated October 10, 1939, with reference to national defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5802. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Resolution of the American Communications Association, Marine Local No. 6, T. J. Van Ermen, secretary, of Seattle, Wash., urging that Congress keep America out of war; maintain the Bill of Rights to protect labor's civil liberties against any and all emergency measures; and urging that belligerent resistance be made to all efforts to curtail, eviscerate, or destroy labor legislation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5803. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition containing answers to questions submitted to Bakery Drivers Local 276, American Federation of Labor, Los Angeles, Calif., by the Special Committee to Investigate the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend William S. Abernethy, D. D., minister, Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God. And because Thou art God, maker and upholder of the universe, the same yesterday, today, and forever, the Changeless One, we turn to Thee at this moment. When we feel our insufficiency, grant us wisdom. When we lose our way, be Thou our guide. When we are weak, make us strong.

In this hour of crisis, give to those who bear great responsibilities of state wisdom equal to the need. May the eyes of this Nation ever be turned Godward, we beseech Thee. Thou art our hope and our salvation. May we in this favored land not disappoint Thee. In the name of Christ, our Lord, we offer this prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day

Tuesday, October 17, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	King	Russell
Andrews	Donahey	La Follette	Schwartz
Austin	Downey	Lee	Schwellenbach
Bailey	Ellender	Lodge	Sheppard
Bankhead	Frazier	Lucas	Shipstead
Barbour	George	Lundeen	Slattery
Barkley	Gerry	McCarran	Smathers
Bilbo	Gibson	McKellar	Stewart
Borah	Gillette	McNary	Taft
Bridges	Green	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Guffey	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Gurney	Minton	Townsend
Burke	Hale	Murray	Truman
Byrd	Harrison	Neely	Tydings
Byrnes	Hatch	Norris	Vandenberg
Capper	Hayden	Nye	Van Nuys
Caraway	Herring	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chandler	Hill	Overton	Walsh
Chavez	Holman	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pittman	White
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

INVITATION TO ATTEND CONFERENCES ON INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL RELATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of State, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 16, 1939.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The series of conferences on inter-American cultural relations arranged by this Department has awakened such widespread interest in all parts of the country that I take pleasure in calling these gatherings to the attention of the Members of the Senate. The purpose of the conference is to enlist the cooperation of the leading private agencies in the United States toward the development of deeper and sounder understanding with the other American republics. I should like to invite all Members of the Senate to attend such of the sessions as may interest them.

The conferences are as follows:

October 18 and 19: Conference on inter-American relations in the field of music, to be held in the Whittall Pavilion, Library of Congress. A program is enclosed.

November 9 and 10: Conference on education and inter-American cultural relations, to be held at the Mayflower Hotel. The program will soon be announced.

November 29 and 30: Conference on books, libraries, and translations. The program is now in preparation.

The Department is gratified at the attention which these conferences have received, and believes they may make an important contribution to the advancement of peace and friendship among the American nations.

I am, my dear Mr. Vice President,
Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

PETITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Georgia, endorsing and approving the plan of the Andersonville Memorial Association for the establishment of a memorial garden at Andersonville, Ga., the placing of bronze markers explanatory of the history of Andersonville (site of a Civil War Confederate military prison), and the erection of an heroic monument in stone, dedicated to peace and union—all "to be commensurate with the virtue of the dead who lie buried there and with the im-